A

GENERAL HISTORY

OF THE

CHRISTIAN CHURCH,

TO THE

FALL OF THE WESTERN EMPIRE.

By JOSEPH PRIESTLEY, LL.D. F.R.S.

AC. IMP. PETROP. R. PARIS. HOLM. TAURIN. ITAL. HARLEM. AUREL. MED. PARIS. CANTAB. AMERIC. ET PHILAD. SOCIUS.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. II.

Ο περι τε θεε διηγηματικος ημιν λογος, τες υπερ αληθειας μαλλον η υπερ παιριδος ανδρισαμενες, αιωνιαις αναγραφεσθαι στηλαις — των ευσεβειας αθλητων τας ενστασεις, και τες επι τελοις στεφανες εις αιωνιον μνημην ανακηρυττων.

EUSEBIUS

BIRMINGHAM,

PRINTED BY THOMAS PEARSON;

AND SOLD BY J. JOHNSON, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD, LONDON.

MDCCXC.

CONTENTS

OF THE

SECOND VOLUME.

THE Introduction

PERIOD VII.

From the Establishment of Conſtantine
pire A. D. 313. till his Death A. D.

Sect. I. Conſtantine's firſt Edict in Favour
tianity, and of the Nature of the Chriſtian

Sect. II. O
nour of the

Sect. III.
of the Dona

Sect. IV. The
the Council of Nice

Sect. V. The Hiſtory of the Council of Nice A. D
325

Sect. VI. From the Council of Nice A. D. 325, to
the Death of Arius. A. D. 336

Sect. VII. Of the Nicene Confeſſions to Hypoſtaſis
Hereſy

Sect. VIII. Of the Circumſtances attending the Death
of Conſtantine A. D. 337

Sect. IX. Of Conſtantine's Conſtancy

MVSEVM
BRITAN
NICVM

CONTENTS

OF THE

SECOND VOLUME.

THE *Introduction* - - page 1

PERIOD VII.

From the Eſtabliſhment of Conſtantine in the Empire A. D. 313, till his Death A. D. 337 2

SECT. I. *Conſtantine's firſt Edict in Favour of Chriſtianity, and of the Union of the Chriſtian Church ibid.*

SECT. II. *Of the Part which Conſtantine took in favour of the Chriſtians againſt the Heathens* 5

SECT. III. *Of Conſtantine's Interference in the Buſineſs of the Donatiſts* - - - 14

SECT. IV. *The Hiſtory of the Arian Controverſy till the Council of Nice* - - 19

SECT. V. *The Hiſtory of the Council of Nice*, A. D. 325 - - - 39

SECT. VI. *From the Council of Nice* A. D. 325, *to the Death of Arius*, A. D. 336 - 60

SECT. VII. *Of the Meaſures of Conſtantine to ſuppreſs Hereſy* - - - 77

SECT. VIII. *Of the Circumſtances attending the Death of Conſtantine* A. D. 337 - 89

SECT. IX. *Of Conſtantine's Converſion to Chriſtianity* 97

PERIOD VIII.

From the Death of Conſtantine A. D. 337, to that of Conſtantius, A. D. 361 - 113

SECT. I. *General Obſervations on the State of Things in this reign* - - *ibid.*

SECT. II. *From the Beginning of the Reign of Conſtantius*, A. D. 337, *to the Council of Sardica*, A. D. 347 - - 120

SECT. III. *From the Council of Sardica* A. D. 347, *to the Death of the Emperor Conſtans* A. D. 350 135

SECT. IV. *From the Death of Conſtans*, A. D. 350, *to that of Gallus*, A. D. 354, *including the Council of Sirmium againſt Photinus* - 143

SECT. V. *From the Death of Gallus* A. D. 354, *to the Council of Ariminum* A. D. 359, *including the riſe of the* ANOMOEANS, *or thoſe who, after Aetius, maintained that the Son was of a Subſtance unlike that of the Father* - - 155

SECT. VI. *Of the Councils of Ariminum and Selucia*, A. D. 359 - - - 164

SECT. VII. *Tranſactions relating to Arianiſm ſubſequent to the Council of Seleucia*, A. D. 359, *and of the Council of Conſtantinople*, A. D. 360. 175

SECT. VIII. *Of the Method by which the Trinitarians diſtinguiſhed themſelves from the Arians at Antioch; and Obſervations on the Progreſs of Arianiſm in this Reign* - - 185

SECT. IX. *Of the Death and Character of Conſtantius* - - 195

SECT. X. *Of the Perſecution of Chriſtians in Perſia, in the Reign of Conſtantius*, A. D. 343 197

SECT.

SECT. XI. *Of the Donatiſts in this Reign* 202
SECT. XII *Of the Monks in this Reign* 204
SECT. XIII. *Of the Chriſtian Writers from the Acceſſion of Conſtantine, to the Death of Conſtantius* - - - 206

PERIOD IX.

The Reign of Julian - - 210
SECT. I. *General Obſervations* - *ibid.*
SECT. II. *Of the Superſtition of Julian* 216
SECT. III. *Inſtances of Julian's Partiality for the Heathens, and his Prejudice againſt the Chriſtians* - - 226
SECT. IV. *Julian's Artifices to ſubvert Chriſtianity, and his Teſtimony in favour of it* - 233
SECT. V. *Julian's more direct Attempts to undermine, and gradually to extirpate Chriſtianity* - 242
SECT. VI. *Violences committed upon Chriſtians, in the Reign of Julian* - - - 255
SECT. VII. *Of Julian's Expedition againſt Perſia, and his Death* - - - 264
SECT. VIII. *Of the Eccleſiaſtical Events of this Reign* - - - 281

PERIOD X.

From the Death of Julian, A. D. 362, to that of Valens, A. D. 379 - - 289
SECT. I. *The Reign of Jovian, conſiſting of ſeven Months* - - *ibid.*
SECT. II. *From the Acceſſion of Valentinian and Valens, A. D. 364, to the Death of Athanaſius* A. D.

A. D. 371, *containing an Account of the Perſecution of the Catholics, and the moderate Arians by Valens* - - - 306

SECT. III. *Of Baſil the Great, and Gregory of Nazianzum, with the Change that took Place in the Doctrine of the Trinity chiefly by their Means* 324

SECT. IV. *Tranſactions in the Weſt till the Death of Valentinian*, A. D. 375 - 332

SECT. V. *From the Death of Valentinian*, A. D. 375, *to that of Valens* A. D. 379, *containing an Account of the Controverſy concerning the Holy Spirit, the Opinions of Apollinaris, and the Divination of ſome Heathen Philoſophers, with a View to find who ſhould be the next Emperor* - 337

SECT. VI. *State of Sects in this Period* - 349

SECT. VII. *Of the Conteſt for the See of Rome after the Death of Liberius, and the Corruption of the Clergy in that City* - - 356

SECT. VIII. *Of the Council of Laodicea* - 359

SECT. IX. *Of the Writers in the Time of Valens* 362

PERIOD XI.

From the Death of Valens, A. D. 378, to that of Theodoſius, A. D. 395 - 366

SECT. I. *Of the State of Things at the Acceſſion of Theodoſius, and his Determination in Favour of what was deemed the Orthodox Faith* - *ibid.*

SECT. II. *Of the Council of Conſtantinople*, A. D. 381 - - - 372

SECT. III. *Other Endeavours of Theodoſius to ſupport the Catholic Faith* - 379

SECT.

SECT. IV. *Transactions of a mixed Nature, civil and religious, with an Account of Theodosius's Death and Character* - - - 385

SECT. V. *Of Heathenism in this Period* 394

SECT. VI. *Of the Priscillianists, and Unitarians in this Period* - - - 405

SECT. VII. *Of the Arians and Novatians in this Reign* - - - 412

SECT. VIII. *Of the Donatists in this Reign* 417

SECT. IX. *Of the Variety of Customs among Christians in this Period* - - 419

SECT. X. *Of a Change in the Discipline of the Eastern Churches in this Reign* - 426

SECT. XI. *Of the Ornaments of Churches, and of Festivals, and the increase of Superstition in this Period* - - 429

PERIOD XII.

From the Death of Theodosius, A. D. 395, to that of Honorius, A. D. 424 - - 435

SECT. I. *From the Accession of Arcadius*, A. D. 395, *to the Deposition of Chrysostom*, A. D. 403. *ibid.*

SECT. II. *From the Deposition of Chrysostom*, A. D. 403, *to his Death*, A. D. 407, *and that of Arcadius* A. D. 408 - - 448

SECT. III. *Of the Disturbances in Egypt* 455

SECT. IV. *An outline of the political Events of the Reign of Honorius* - - 460

SECT. V. *Events relating to Heathenism* - - 463

SECT. VI. *Of the Arians in this Period* - 468

SECT. VII. *Of the Novatians* - 472

SECT. VIII. *Of the Donatists* - 475

SECT.

SECT. IX. *Of the Pelagian Controverſy* 478

SECT. X. *Of the Writers in the Time of Theodoſius and his Sons* - - - 488

PERIOD XIII.

From the Death of Honorius, A. D. 424, to the fall of the Weſtern Empire, A. D. 475 499

SECT. I. *Of the Neſtorian Controverſy, till the Council of Epheſus* - - - *ibid.*

SECT. II. *Of the Council of Epheſus, and the Conſequences of it* - - 507

SECT. III. *Of the Eutychian Controverſy till the Death of Theodoſius* II. A. D. 456 514

SECT. IV. *Of the Council of Chalcedon*, A. D. 451 - - - 518

SECT. V. *The Conſequences of the Council of Chalcedon till the Death of Marcian*, A. D. 457 524

SECT. VI. *Tranſactions relating to Eutychianiſm, ſubſequent to the Acceſſion of Leo the Thracian*, A. D. 474 - - - 529

SECT. VII. *General Obſervations on the four Oecumenical Councils* - - 533

SECT. VIII. *Tranſactions of a civil Nature in the Weſt, from the Death of Honorius to the Fall of the Empire* - - - 539

SECT. IX. *Tranſactions of an Eccleſiaſtical Nature in the Weſt, from the Death of Honorius to the Fall of the Weſtern Empire* - 543

SECT. X. *Of Writers within this Period* 547

A View of the Succeſſion of the Roman Emperors, and of the Biſhops in the greater Sees to the Fall of the Weſtern Empire - - 553

A

GENERAL HISTORY

OF THE

CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

PERIOD VII.

FROM THE ESTABLISHMENT OF CONSTANTINE IN THE EMPIRE A. D. 313, TILL HIS DEATH A. D. 337.

WE have now ſeen the full eſtabliſhment of the power of Conſtantine, in conjunction with Licinius, by the deaths of Maxentius and Maximin. I ſhall now proceed to recite all the ſubſequent tranſactions, in which the power of the ſtate was employed in the affairs of the church, that we may have a diſtinct view of the ſituation of the two rival powers, *chriſtianity* and *heatheniſm*, and alſo of the different ſects of chriſtians from the beginning, to the end of this important reign.

SECTION I.

Conſtantine's firſt Edict in Favour of Chriſtianity, and of the Union of the Chriſtian church.

THE firſt edict of Conſtantine and Licinius in conjunction, was iſſued from Milan, A. D. 313. By this liberty was given to every perſon to profeſs, unmoleſted, which ever of the two religions he pleaſed. It was alſo provided, that the places of public worſhip, and any other kind of property which had belonged to the chriſtians, but of which they had been deprived in the late perſecution, ſhould be reſtored to them; and that if any part of their property had been given to others, indemnification ſhould be made to them out of the public treaſury*. This was afterwards confirmed by Conſtantine in a reſcript addreſſed to Anulinus, the proconſul of Africa†.

By another reſcript, addreſſed to the ſame Anulinus, the chriſtian clergy were exempted

* Euſeb. Hiſt. Lib. x. Cap. 5. p. 480.

from

from all civil offices, that they might attend without diſtraction, to their ſpiritual functions†.

Beſides allowing the chriſtians the full exerciſe of their religion, and reſtoring to them whatever they had been deprived of in the late perſecution, Conſtantine likewiſe ordered large ſums of money to be given to the more eminent of the biſhops, to defray ſuch expences as they ſhould deem to be moſt neceſſary. A letter of this kind, addreſſed to Cæcilianus biſhop of Carthage, is preſerved in Euſebius‡. In it Conſtantine informs him, that Urſus, the treaſurer of Africa, had received orders to grant him three thouſand *folles* or *purſes* (each ſuppoſed to contain three pounds and an half of ſilver) and ſaying that if any thing more was wanting, he ſhould apply to Heraclides his ſteward, and receive it of him. In this letter Conſtantine likewiſe informs Cæcilianus, that he had heard of the catholic church in Africa, being diſturbed by a faction, and that he had given orders to Anulinus the proconſul, and to Patricius, the deputy of the præfect, to attend to this buſineſs, and to

* Euſeb. Hiſt. Lib. x. Cap. 5. p. 483.

† Ibid. Cap. 7. p. 487. ‡ Ibid. Cap. 6. p. 486.

act in it with vigour; and that, if he found any more refractorineſs in the party that was hoſtile to him, he muſt give information of it to thoſe officers, who would act in it according to his orders.

Conſtantine had certainly the beſt intentions in this buſineſs, and in every thing elſe that he attempted of a ſimilar nature, and never imagined that he was going beyond the bounds of his proper province, and ſtill leſs beyond his power, in his endeavours to heal the diviſions of the chriſtian church. Had he adhered to his firſt edict, by which he gave liberty to all perſons to profeſs, and to practiſe, whatever religion they pleaſed, all had been well; but by interpoſing his own civil authority in matters of religion, he, unknown to himſelf, was laying the foundation for ſuch an union of civil and eccleſiaſtical power, as in after ages produced infinite miſchief in the world, corrupting that religion to which he was a well-wiſher, and doing whatever was in the power of man to render thoſe corruptions perpetual. We ſhall ſoon ſee the iſſue of this firſt attempt that was ever made by any chriſtian prince to put an end to difference of opinion among chriſtians; but

we

we muſt firſt attend to ſimilar meaſures with reſpect to the heathen religion, and then to other differences among chriſtians of more importance than this.

SECTION II.

Of the Part which Conſtantine took in Favour of the Chriſtians againſt the Heathens.

BESIDES the edict for the toleration of the chriſtian religion, the reſtoration of whatever had belonged to the churches, and the largeſſes to different places, according to their occaſions, Conſtantine did all that was in the power of man to do in favour of thoſe who had ſuffered in the perſecution. Thoſe who had been baniſhed were recalled; thoſe who had been condemned to the mines, or any other drudgery, were ſet at liberty; thoſe who had been degraded, were reſtored to their honours; or if they did not chuſe to reſume their former offices, they were permittted to enjoy the profits of them, and to

live as they pleaſed*. The goods and eſtates of the martyrs which had been confiſcated, were all reſtored to their natural heirs, or if no heirs could be found, to the churches; and in whatever manner the property had been diſpoſed of, or through whatever hands it had paſſed, the public treaſury was reſponſible for it†.

The chriſtianity of Conſtantine naturally enough led him to examine into the ſtate of Chriſt's ſepulchre, and finding that it had been buried under heaps of rubbiſh, and that a temple of Venus had been erected on the place, he ordered it to be cleared; and the ſepulchre itſelf being found uninjured, he built over it a magnificent chriſtian church‡. He alſo built a church at Bethlehem, in honour of our Saviour's nativity, and another on the Mount of Olives, the place from which he aſcended to Heaven. Theſe churches were built at the particular requeſt of his mother Helena, a woman of great piety and benevolence, who afterwards viſited the churches, and ornamented them.‖ He

* Vita Conſt. Lib. ii. Cap. 20. p. 546.
† Ibid. Cap. 21. p. 546.
‡ Ibid. Lib. iii. Cap. 25. p. 593, &c.
‖ Ibid. Cap. 41, &c. p. 600, &c.

alſo

alſo commiſſioned Euſebius biſhop of Cæſarea, in Paleſtine, to build a church at Mamre, the place where God appeared to Abraham*. The building of churches in theſe particular ſituations, diſcovers the ſuperſtition of the age, from which Conſtantine was far from being exempt. Beſides theſe he built a magnificent church at Nicomedia, and in other cities of the empire†.

With reſpect to Conſtantinople, the place of his reſidence, he not only built in it many magnificent churches, but (ολ@ εμπνεων θευ σοφιας) wholly *inſpired by the wiſdom of God*, as Euſebius ſays (but as he ought rather to have ſaid, taking upon him to do what ought to have been left to God himſelf) he aboliſhed all idolatry within its precincts, ſo that no trace of the heathen worſhip, no temple, altar, ſacrifice, or feſtival, remained in it‡.

The ſooner to aboliſh Paganiſm, he took away the veſtibules, or doors, from ſome of the temples, and the roofs from others. Some brazen images, which had been revered by the ſuperſtition of ages, he removed from their former ſituations into the public market place.

* Vita. Conſt. Lib. iii. Cap. 52, &c. p. 607, &c.
† Ibid. Cap. 50. p. 605.
‡ Ibid. Cap. 48. p. 604.

Here you might ſee the Pythian Apollo, ſays Euſebius, and there the Sminthian. The ſacred tripods of Delphos were placed in the Circus, and the Muſes of Helicon in the palace, ſo that the whole city of Conſtantinople was filled with the beſt ſtatues, collected from all the provinces; and thoſe images to which hecatombs had once been ſacrificed, were now expoſed to public ridicule.

So little was there of zeal for the heathen religion left, that to do all this, Conſtantine had no occaſion to employ an army. He only ſent his pious friends, to make the circuit of the provinces; and wherever they came, they did every thing they wiſhed to do without the leaſt danger, even from the mob. They obliged the prieſts to produce their idols, and ſtripping them of their gorgeous dreſſes, publicly expoſed their interior deformities. Taking off the precious metals with which ſome of them were covered, they melted them into uſeful utenſils; but things that could not be converted to any uſe, they left to be expoſed, as monuments of ridiculous ſuperſtition *.

Conſtantine totally demoliſhed a temple of Venus at Aphaca on Mount Libanus, a place

* Vita, Conſt. Lib. iii. Cap. 64. p. 609.

remote

remote from any city, and infamous for the impure rites of proſtitution and ſodomy*. In the ſame manner he treated a celebrated temple of Æſculapius at Ægæ in Cilicia †, and a much more celebrated temple at Heliopolis in Syria, where the moſt abominable proſtitutions had been practiſed in honour of Venus, and he erected a handſome church in the place ‡.

Our hiſtorian obſerves, that when the heathens ſaw all this to be done with impunity, and that the ſoldiers entered without fear, and without danger, into the moſt ſacred receſſes of their temples, and expoſed to light what had long been concealed in darkneſs, many of them were convinced of the folly of their ancient religion, and became chriſtians ‖. In many places the people, of their own accord, deſtroyed their temples, and built chriſtian churches in their place ¶.

At length Conſtantine ordered all the heathen temples to be ſhut up, and forbade all ſacrifices to the heathen gods through all the Roman empire **.

* Vita. Conſt. Lib. iii. Cap. 55. p. 610.
† Ibid. Cap. 56. p. 611. ‡ Ibid. Cap. 58. p. 613.
‖ Ibid. Cap. 57. p. 612.
¶ Ibid. Lib. iv. Cap. 39. p. 647.
** Ibid. Cap. 23. p. 638.

He

He particularly forbade all the ſecret rites of initiation, all the arts of divination, and the ſpectacles of gladiators. Whereas the Egyptians imagined that the increaſe of the Nile depended upon ſome religious ceremonies in which ſodomy was practiſed, he aboliſhed thoſe abominable rites; and it was obſerved that when ſome ſuperſtitious heathens imagined that the Nile would not overflow as uſual, it even roſe higher after this*. Thus Conſtantine acted the part of a biſhop with reſpect to things out of the church, a title which he pleaſantly gave himſelf when he entertained the biſhops at his table, while they were biſhops with reſpect to things within the church†. In this character he acted when he forbade any Jew to have a chriſtian ſlave, but more eſpecially when, by his imperial authority, he enforced all the decrees of the councils‡.

It is pleaſing, however, to find that, notwithſtanding the zeal of Conſtantine in favour of chriſtianity, and againſt heatheniſm, we do not read of his offering violence to the perſon of any man; owing perhaps not ſo much to

* Vita. Conſt. Lib. iv. Cap. 25. p. 639.
† Ibid. Cap. 24. p. 638.
‡ Ibid. Cap. 27. p. 640.

his

his lenity, as to the general indifference of the heathens with reſpect to their religion, in conſequence of their having no attachment to it but what aroſe from their having been educated in it, and a confuſed idea that the obſervance of its rites was, in ſome unknown manner connected with their temporal proſperity. They did not pretend to have any proper *evidence* of its truth, and they ſhewed their zeal for it only by perſecuting the chriſtians, and not by their readineſs to ſuffer any thing themſelves; ſo different was the operation of their zeal and that of the chriſtians; a difference which can only be accounted for from the chriſtians knowing, and being fully perſuaded of, the great truths for which they ſuffered, as being founded on evident facts, for which they could produce the cleareſt hiſtorical evidence; whereas the heathens could ſay nothing in favour of their religion, but that it had been practiſed by their anceſtors, on what grounds they could not tell.

It is evident, however, from the ſubſequent hiſtory, that the edicts of Conſtantine were by no means carried into rigid execution, for the heathen worſhip was continued in moſt places, and eſpecially in the villages; the common and illiterate people, who have the

leaſt intercourſe with the world, and who are the leaſt diſpoſed to ſpeculate, being always the laſt to change their opinions, or practices. On this account the heathens being for the moſt part to be found in the villages, and not in the cities, they got the name of *pagani pagans*, from *pagus*, a village.

It is evident from the life of Conſtantine by Euſebius*, that all who choſe to worſhip the heathen gods were at liberty to do it; and in his oration addreſſed to the chriſtians †, he bids the heathens go to their ſacrifices, feſtivals, and debauches if they choſe it; telling them, however, that under the pretence of celebrating their ſacred rites, they only indulged their own luſts.

Conſtantine did real ſervice to chriſtianity by writing to Sapor, king of Perſia, in favour of the chriſtians in his kingdom, of whom he had been informed there were great numbers, but where they had probably been much perſecuted at different times, as well as in all the provinces of the Roman empire, and indeed wherever they were ſettled, though we have no particular account of their ſufferings, or of

* Euſeb. Hiſt. Lib. iii. Cap. 56. p. 563.

† Ibid. Cap. 11. p. 688.

the

the number of martyrs among them. But the ſpirit of heatheniſm, and alſo that of chriſtianity, being the ſame in all places, we may ſafely conclude that the treatment of the chriſtians in one country was in general pretty much the ſame in all the reſt. In this letter he informs the Perſian monarch, that by the help of God he had eſtabliſhed the true religion from the utmoſt boundary of the Weſt, and through all the provinces of his empire; that in the captivity of Valerian, and in the overthrow of the perſecuting emperors over whom he had triumphed, God had ſhewn himſelf to be the enemy of haughtineſs, ſuperſtition, and cruelty. He concludes with expreſſing his ſatisfaction in hearing of the multitude of chriſtians there were in his dominions, and recommending them to his favour and protection *.

As a proof that Sapor had nothing to fear from tolerating, or embracing, chriſtianity, the argument of Conſtantine was, no doubt, very proper; but he miſtook the nature of chriſtianity if he imagined that (excepting peace of mind and inward ſatisfaction) any part of the rewards of it are in this life.

* Vita Conſt. L. iv. Cap. 9, p. 631, &c.

In

In this letter there is no alluſion to any perſecution of the chriſtians by Sapor, and whether he had exerciſed any ſeverities againſt them at this time does not appear; but afterwards he carried on a very cruel perſecution of them, of which an account will be given in the reign of Conſtantius, though Sozomen refers it to the time of Conſtantine.

SECTION III.

Of Conſtantine's Interference in the Buſineſs of the Donatiſts.

WHEN Conſtantine wrote the letter above-mentioned, the famous Donatus, from whom the whole ſect was denominated, had ſucceeded Majorinus; and the Donatiſts, perceiving that they were aimed at in the letter, and being much offended at it, applied to the proconſul to depoſe Cæcilianus, and to give the biſhopric of Carthage to Donatus. But he, not chuſing to act by his own authority, referred them to the emperor, who appointed three biſhops of Gaul or Germany, and

and Miltiades, biſhop of Rome, to hear and decide in the caſe. At the ſame time he wrote to Miltiades a letter which is preſerved by Euſebius *, in which he expreſſes his concern that the chriſtians, and their biſhops, ſhould be divided among themſelves; and informs him, that he had given orders that Cæcilianus, with ten biſhops to be named by himſelf, and ten others choſen by the Donatiſts, ſhould go to Rome, and that he had appointed that he, and three other biſhops ſhould examine into the affair, and decide between them; ſaying, that ſuch was his concern for the moſt holy catholic church, that he would not ſuffer any ſchiſm to remain in it.

In conſequence of this, the ten biſhops of each claſs repaired to Rome; and Miltiades having called a council of fifteen other biſhops of Italy, they, in conjunction with three others particularly appointed by the emperor, heard the complaints of the Donatiſts againſt Cæcilianus; and not only acquitted him, but paſſed a cenſure on Donatus for having rebaptized catholics, and for having ordained biſhops who had apoſtatized in the late perſecution.

With this deciſion the Donatiſts were by no means ſatisfied, and they applied again to the

* Hiſt. Lib. x. Cap. 5. p. 484.

emperor,

emperor, complaining of the partiality of thoſe who had been judges in their cauſe. On this Conſtantine ſent two biſhops to Carthage to ſee if the difference might not be compromiſed on the ſpot; but they returned without having ſeen any reaſon to condemn the deciſion of the council of Italy, though without having been able to give any ſatisfaction to the Donatiſts. Conſtantine then condeſcended to hear the parties himſelf at Breſcia, but neither was he able to accommodate their differences.

The diſturbance increaſing, rather than being leſſened, after the return of the parties to Africa, Conſtantine ordered a general council to meet at Arles; and one of his letters on this ſubject, addreſſed to the biſhop of Syracuſe, is preſerved by Euſebius *. In it he informs him of the ſteps which he had taken to heal this breach, and that ſince the Donatiſts (whom he does not mention by name, but by a deſcription which ſhews that he was much diſpleaſed with them) had complained of the ſmall number of biſhops who had decided againſt them before, he had ſummoned a greater number to judge in the caſe; and therefore ordered that he, and two of his

* Hiſt. Lib. x. Cap. 5. p. 485.

his preſbyters, and three ſervants, travelling at the public expence, ſhould meet his brethren at Arles, on the calends of Auguſt following.

Accordingly, two hundred biſhops attended, one of whom was Reſtitutus from London, and Martin, the biſhop of Arles, preſided in it. In this council, held A. D. 314, Cæcilianus was acquitted, and the Donatiſts condemned again. But even this ſolemn deciſion did not put an end to the ſchiſm. The Donatiſts appealed once more to the emperor himſelf; and two years after this, viz. A. D. 316, he gave them another hearing, at Milan, or Arles, when he again declared Cæcilianus innocent, and ordered that they ſhould give him no farther trouble on the ſubject. But they complaining, and perhaps juſtly, that the emperor had been prepoſſeſſed by their enemies (and indeed all his orders reſpecting this buſineſs ſufficiently ſhew it) returned to Africa in as bad temper as ever. They even violently ſeized upon a church which had belonged to the catholics, but probably one of which they had been unjuſtly diſpoſſeſſed. This Conſtantine ordered to be reſtored, and moreover intended to go in perſon to Africa, to put a final end to this ſchiſm, which had

given him ſo much trouble. But this not being convenient to him, he contented himſelf with giving orders that all the Donatiſts ſhould be baniſhed.

Afterwards, finding that this harſh meaſure had been productive of more miſchief than good, and perhaps being, upon reflection, more favourably diſpoſed towards the Donatiſts, he relented in their favour, and A. D. 321, recalled them from baniſhment, but without permitting them to build churches, or to hold any public aſſemblies. In conſequence of this the Donatiſts, who conſidered themſelves as in a ſtate of perſecution, and did not chuſe to abandon the exerciſe of their religion, were obliged to live in the mountainous parts of the country, where, in a courſe of time, many of them degenerated into a kind of banditti, and got the name of *Circumcelliones*. Then, conſidering themſelves as exiles from their country, they committed the moſt horrid depredations on the inhabitants of the plains; though it is probable that the accounts of theſe diſorders are much exaggerated by their enemies, from whom alone we have all that we know of them.

This was the firſt attempt of a chriſtian emperor to decide a controverſy in religion, and

and the iſſue ſhews how very unpromiſing the precedent was. However, the intention of Conſtantine was unqueſtionably good.

SECTION IV.

The Hiſtory of the Arian Controverſy till the Council of Nice.

IN the courſe of this period of my hiſtory there aroſe a controverſy in the chriſtian church, the conſequences of which were far greater, both with reſpect to extent and duration, than thoſe of any that were of a merely ſpeculative nature, from the origin of chriſtianity to the preſent day. The commotion occaſioned by it was ſo ſudden, and ſpread ſo faſt, that Euſebius compares it to a large conflagration ariſing from a ſmall ſpark. Beginning at Alexandria, it preſently ſpread over all Egypt, the extreme parts of Thebais, and Lybia, and then over other cities and provinces; ſo as not only to divide the biſhops, and engage them in eager controverſy, as with ſwords, ſays our hiſtorian, but the com-

mon people alſo; ſome of them taking part with one ſide, and ſome with the other. The ſcandal it gave was ſo great, that it even furniſhed a ſubject for comedy on the theatres of the heathens *.

This was the famous *Arian controverſy* relating to the perſon of Chriſt. And it is not a little remarkable, that chriſtians ſhould have intereſted themſelves more to determine who Chriſt was, than what he did, or taught; which, as a prophet, or a meſſenger from God to man, it certainly moſt concerns his profeſſed diſciples to inform themſelves of.

Till this period we have ſeen only three diſtinct opinions concerning Chriſt. The firſt, and by univerſal confeſſion the oldeſt, that of his being ſimply a man, the Meſſiah of the Jews. The ſecond was that of the Gnoſtics, who thought him to be a ſuper-angelic ſpirit, either ſuperadded to a man, or aſſuming only the appearance of one. The third was that of the platonizing Fathers, who thought that, to the man Jeſus, who conſiſted of a body and ſoul, like other men, there was ſuperadded not a ſuper-angelic ſpirit (which had the ſame origin with other derived ſpiritual ſubſtances) but the logos of the

* Vita Conſt. Lib. iii. Cap. 61. p. 565.

Supreme Being himſelf, a principle that was uncreated, and properly divine.

This attribute was ſuppoſed to have been originally the ſame with reſpect to God, that *reaſon* is with reſpect to man; but that it had been detached from him, as a ray of light from the ſun, firſt for the purpoſe of creating the material worlds, then to form thoſe appearances with which the patriarchs were favoured, and laſtly that it reſided permanently in Jeſus Chriſt; ſo that, with reſpect to the ſuperior part of his compoſition, he might be ſaid to have exiſted before the creation of the world, though not long before that event. This, however, being before the commencement of what is uſually called *time*, might be ſaid to be, in the way of ſpeaking which was cuſtomary in this period, *from eternity*. According to this ſyſtem, Chriſt was God, and likewiſe the being who made the world, and who had been the medium of all the intercourſe which the Divine Being had with it in all ages.

But in this period we find at leaſt the principal elements of another diſtinct opinion concerning the perſon of Chriſt, viz. that the *logos* which was one part of him, was not an *uncreated* principle, but had been *made*, like

other things, *out of nothing*, and was not ſuper-added to a complete man, but was a proper ſoul to the body of Jeſus. To this created logos, were aſcribed all the functions of the uncreated one, viz. that of having made all things, and of having been the viſible Jehovah of the Old Teſtament, or the medium of all the divine communications of God with mankind. We ſhall find, however, if we attentively conſider the following hiſtory, that it was a long time, not leſs than half a century, before this new opinion was completely formed, and maintained by any conſiderable number of perſons. For it is reſolvable into ſeveral diſtinct parts, and the connexion there is between them was not diſtinctly perceived at firſt, ſo that they were adopted one after another, and were held with much inconſiſtency and heſitation, as has generally been the caſe with other new ſyſtems of doctrine.

Radically different as this opinion is from that of the platonizing Fathers, the learned world was in ſome meaſure prepared for it, by the gradual evaneſcence of the philoſophical doctrine of the *emanation* of all ſpirits from the ſubſtance of God, which was thought to render him too much like material ſubſtances, and by the ſcriptural idea of a proper

creation

creation out of nothing, which philoſophers had never admitted. Alſo the platonizing Fathers, in the apologies which they made for their new doctrine of the divinity of Chriſt to the common people, had been led to ſpeak of him as greatly inferior to the Father; and in their controverſies with the learned unitarians, they had even ſaid that he was of a *different ſubſtance* from the Father; the divinity of the Father and that of the Son not being *the ſame*, as the Sabellians were charged with making it.

Now it clearly followed, that if Chriſt was of a different ſubſtance from the Father, he could not be properly *divine*, but muſt have been *created* like other things, and, like them, *out of nothing*. And ſince it had always been ſuppoſed that the logos did not aſſume perſonality till juſt before the creation of the world, there muſt have been a time when he did not exiſt at all. Theſe natural conſequences, however, had not been attended to, but they gave a great advantage to the defenders of the new opinion, and contributed greatly to embarraſs the advocates of that doctrine which, by the deciſion of councils, was deemed to be orthodox.

The little ſpark, as Euſebius calls it, which occaſioned the great conflagration, aroſe as follows. Arius, a preſbyter of the church of Alexandria, who excelled in logic (a ſcience which was much cultivated by the learned of that age) having advanced an opinion concerning the perſon of Chriſt, which occaſioned ſome diſpute among the clergy, Alexander, the biſhop, at firſt neglected it; but, at the perſuaſion of his friends, he at length gave both parties a hearing, and though towards the beginning of the conference he did not ſeem to favour one party more than the other, at length he took part againſt Arius. This is the account of Sozomen *,

But Socrates ſays, that as Alexander was diſcourſing in an oſtentatious manner (φιλοτιμοτερον) on the ſubject of the trinity, in the preſence of his preſbyters, and (uſing philoſophical language) ſaid that there was *an unity in the trinity* (εν τριαδι μοναδα ειναι) Arius, one of his preſbyters, replied that ſuch language ſavoured of Sabellianiſm, which undoubtedly it did; for the Sabellians had always been charged with confounding the perſons of the trinity, and making them to be only one.

* Hiſt. Lib. i. Cap. 15. p. 31.

In

In the courſe of the debate Arius likewiſe ſaid, that if the Father begat the Son, there muſt have been a beginning of the Son's exiſtence, and conſequently a time when he was not. This was the language of ſtandard orthodoxy, if by the exiſtence of Chriſt was meant his exiſtence *as a ſon*. For Tertullian, in conformity with the doctrine of his age, ſaid, "There was a time when God was "neither a father nor a judge; ſince he could "not be a father before he had a ſon, nor a "judge before there was ſin." But the language of Arius was not orthodox, if by the exiſtence of Chriſt, or of the ſon, was meant that *principle*, or *attribute* in the Father, which before the creation of the world became the ſon; and therefore what Arius added, viz. that ſince there was a time when the ſon was not, he muſt have been created out of nothing, did not follow *.

Such was the doctrine that Arius advanced in this caſual, but famous conference, which is ſuppoſed to have been held A. D. 315. What was at that time urged in defence of the old, or of the new opinion, is not recorded; but the particulars being reported abroad, very great conſequences ſoon follow-

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. i. Cap. 5. p. 9.

ed

ed. The opinion of Arius appeared ſo plauſible, that it ſpread rapidly in Egypt, the Upper Thebais, and Lybia, and even to more diſtant places, eſpecially in the Eaſt, where it was patronized by many, and eſpecially by Euſebius biſhop of Nicomedia, one of the moſt diſtinguiſhed prelates of that age.

They who took the part of Arius at Alexandria were Aithalas, Achillas, Carpones, Sarmata, and another Arius, who were all preſbyters, and Euzoius, Macarius, Lucius, Julianus, Menas, and Helladius, who were deacons. They were alſo joined by a great part of the laity of the city, and by Theonas and Secundus, biſhops in Egypt *.

Alexander, offended at the great and unexpected popularity of his opponent, called a council of about an hundred biſhops, in which the opinion of Arius was condemned, and himſelf and his friends of the clergy were degraded. Alſo, according to the cuſtom of the times, he ſent an account of the reſolutions of this council to the biſhops of diſtant ſees. The letter is preſerved in Socrates, and is to this effect.

After ſpeaking of Arius as the forerunner of Antichriſt, and warning thoſe to whom he

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. i. Cap. 6. p. 11.

wrote

wrote againſt regarding any thing that ſhould be ſaid in his favour by Euſebius of Nicomedia (who he ſaid had taken his part only to promote his own purpoſes) he mentions the followers of Arius in Egypt, and then gives an account of his faith; as aſſerting that Chriſt was of a ſubſtance different from that of the Father, that there was a time when he was not; that he was a creature, and not the true wiſdom of the father; that he was liable to change like other creatures; that he does not perfectly know the father, who was inviſible to him; that he was not able perfectly to comprehend himſelf, that he was made for our uſe (viz. that by his means God might create us) and that he might even change for the worſe as the devil had done.

In this account there is either much exaggeration, or the biſhop muſt have taken advantage of expreſſions which dropped from Arius in the heat of debate, and which he retracted afterwards.

In anſwer to theſe poſitions, real or ſuppoſed, of Arius, the biſhop proceeds to ſay, that they are inconſiſtent with what John ſays of the logos, which was in the beginning with God, and that all things that were created, were created by him, ſo that on his hypotheſis the

ſon

Son muſt have made himſelf; that he could not have been made out of nothing, becauſe it is ſaid that the logos comes from the heart, the womb, or the ſubſtance of God; that he cannot be of a ſubſtance diſſimilar to that of the father, becauſe he is ſaid to be the expreſs image of his perſon, and becauſe he ſaid *he that ſeeth me, ſeeth the father.* If the Son was the reaſon and the wiſdom of the Father, there could never be a time when he was not, for then God muſt have been without reaſon or wiſdom; Chriſt could never have been liable to change, becauſe he ſaid *I am in the father and the father in me, I and the father are one;* and the apoſtle ſays of him, that he is *the ſame yeſterday, to day, and for ever.* He muſt know the Father, becauſe he expreſſly ſaid, *the father knows me, and I know the father.*

I mention theſe particulars of this letter, becauſe they tend to explain the nature of the controverſy, and are ſuch arguments as were always alleged by the catholics againſt the Arians, and therefore need not be repeated on any future occaſion. The biſhop concludes his circular letter with violent invectives againſt Arius and his followers, and again warning all perſons againſt paying any regard to what

Euſebius

Euſebius of Nicomedia might write in his favour*.

Alexander, ſeeing that Arius was not diſcouraged by his degradation and excommunication, but that he and his friends formed ſeparate congregations, wrote a longer letter on the ſubject to Alexander biſhop of Conſtantinople, in which he complains of being even perſecuted by the Arians (which implies that their numbers were very great) and in which he argues much more largely againſt their opinions. But as in this letter he ſays that their doctrine was the ſame with that of Ebion, Artemas, Paulus Samoſatenſis, and Lucian of Antioch, in which he was certainly miſtaken, it is the more probable that there might be ſome miſrepreſentation in the firſt account that he gave of the opinions of Arius. To the ſame purpoſe he wrote to Philogonius biſhop of Antioch, and to Euſtathius biſhop of Berea†.

On the other hand, Arius, in vindication of himſelf, wrote to his friend Euſebius of Nicomedia, complaining of his perſecution by Alexander, for not aſſenting to the following aſſertions, viz. That the ſon was always, that he exiſted in God in an unbegotten ſtate, that

* Socratis Lib. i. Cap. 6. p. 10.

† Theodoreti Hiſt. Lib. 1. Cap. 4. p. 9.

he

he was always begotten (ατιγεννης, αγεννετογεννης) that the Father did not precede the Son a ſingle moment, and that he derived his being from the ſubſtance of God himſelf. He ſays that all the biſhops of the Eaſt agreed with him in ſaying, that God, who alone was (αγεννητος) *without origin*, preceded the Son, except Philogonius of Antioch, Hellanicus of Tripoli, and Macarius of Jeruſalem, of whom the firſt ſaid that the Son was an *eructation* from the Father, the ſecond a *projection* from him, and the third that he was equally with himſelf *unbegotten* συναγεννητον; impieties, which he ſays he could not bear, though thoſe heretics ſhould threaten him with a thouſand deaths.

As to himſelf, he ſays, that he had always profeſſed that the Son was not unbegotten (αγεννητος) in any ſenſe, nor produced from any thing that pre-exiſted, but was made by the will of the Father before the ages, complete God, the only begotten, and immutable; but that he did not exiſt before he was begotten, or created. I am perſecuted, he adds, becauſe I ſaid the Son has an origin (αρχην εχει) but God has none (αναρχος) that the Son is from the things that were not, not being part of God, or made of any pre-exiſting matter. Here I would obſerve, that Arius allows the title of God

God to the ſon, though in an inferior ſenſe, but denies what was laid to his charge of Chriſt being liable to change. In this letter Arius enumerates among his friends Euſebius of Cæſarea, Theodotus of Laodicea, Paulinus of Tyre, Athanaſius of Anazarbus, Gregory of Berytus, and Ætius of Lydda*.

On receiving this letter, and after calling, it is ſaid, a council of the biſhops of Bithynia, in concurrence with them, Euſebius wrote to Paulinus biſhop of Tyre, deſiring that he would write to Alexander, not doubting the weight of his authority with him, and expreſſing his ſurprize at the novelty of his aſſertions, and the weakneſs of his reaſons. "We never "heard," he ſays "of two that were unbegot- "ten, or of one being divided into two, which "would ſuppoſe them to be of a corporeal na- "ture; but of one unbegotten, and another "produced by him, but not from his ſub- "ſtance, or in any reſpect of the ſame nature "with him. We read in the ſcripture that "Chriſt was created, as when he ſays (Prov. "viii. 1.) *God created me in the beginning of his "ways.* If the term begotten muſt be under- "ſtood of the derivation from the ſubſtance "of God, other beings have the ſame origin

* Theodoreti, Hiſt. Lib. i. Cap. 5. p. 22.

" with Chriſt, for they are ſaid to be begotten " by God, as Iſa. i. 2. *I have begotten chil-* " *dren* *."

Arius alſo and his friends wrote to Alexander, aſſerting that the doctrine which they held was the ſame that he himſelf had openly taught in their hearing, viz. that there is one God, who alone is unbegotten, immutable, &c. who begat his Son at his own pleaſure, before all time, a perfect creature of God, though not like any other creature, and that when, at his creation, he imparted all glory to the Son, he could not be ſuppoſed to diveſt himſelf of his prerogative, of having all things originally in himſelf, for he is the fountain of all. There are therefore three hypoſtaſes, the Father, the Son, and the Spirit; but that though Chriſt was begotten before all time, he was not therefore eternal, or coeternal with God; and that on the principle of Chriſt being of the ſame ſubſtance with the father, God muſt be corporeal and diviſible.

Almoſt all the language of this letter might have been uſed alike by the orthodox and the Arians. For the platonizing Fathers had frequently called the *generation* of the ſon *a creation*, and by the phraſe *before all time* they

* Theodoreti, Hiſt. Lib. i. Cap. vi. p. 23.

meant

meant before the creation of the world, but not properly *from all eternity*. They had alſo uniformly repreſented him as greatly inferior to the Father, and as having derived all things from him. But it is evident from their writings, that, notwithſtanding this, they conſidered the Son as the perſonified reaſon of the Father, and therefore as *in him* properly eternal.

Euſebius of Nicomedia alſo wrote to Euſebius of Cæſarea, and Patrophilus of Scythopolis, requeſting, at the ſame time, that they would permit Arius, and thoſe of his friends who were of the rank of Preſbyters, to preach in congregations belonging to their churches, as was the cuſtom in Alexandria. To this requeſt the biſhops above-mentioned, and alſo the other biſhops of Paleſtine, conſented*.

While Alexander and Arius were thus exerting themſelves to ſtrengthen their reſpective parties, all the chriſtian world was full of contention, churches being divided againſt churches, and perſons of the ſame neighbourhood and family were alſo divided, and exaſperated againſt each other†.

The pious and well meaning emperor, for ſuch undoubtedly he was, was deeply con-

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. i. Cap. 15. p. 33.

† Ibid.

cerned that the religion which he had embraced ſhould be diſgraced by ſuch altercations, on a ſubject, which, whether he well underſtood or not, at that time appeared to him to be of a very trifling nature; and that he might not neglect to do every thing in his power to prevent the farther ſpread of the miſchief, he himſelf wrote to the parties concerned, by Hoſius biſhop of Corduba in Spain, one of the moſt reſpectable prelates of his age, and for whom the emperor had very juſtly a great eſteem.

He begins with ſaying, that the great object of his reign was to accompliſh two things, firſt to eſtabliſh the uniform worſhip of God among all nations, and then to correct all abuſes of a civil nature. The former of theſe he hoped to compaſs by addreſs, and in the latter he meant to employ force; but he ſaid that he ſhould more eaſily accompliſh the latter, if he could firſt ſucceed in the former. Then, having expreſſed the deep concern which the diſturbances in Africa (meaning thoſe concerning the Donatiſts) had given him, and the meaſures which he had taken to put an end to them, he obſerves that the diſſenſions which had now ariſen among them were of a much more threatening nature than thoſe; and

yet

yet that when he endeavoured to trace the cauſe of them, it appeared to him to be very inconſiderable. He therefore hoped, that by making himſelf a moderator in the diſpute, it might be brought to an amicable termination.

He then blames both the parties, Alexander for propoſing queſtions on ſuch a difficult ſubject, and Arius for entering into the diſcuſſion of them; but he hoped that by mutual acknowledgments, and mutual forgiveneſs, they might be reconciled; eſpecially, as in reality, they held the ſame opinions. He farther obſerved, that if philoſophers could adhere to the ſame ſect, notwithſtanding ſeveral differences of opinion, much more might chriſtians hold communion with each other, notwithſtanding ſuch differences as were among them. He therefore earneſtly entreated them to reſtore to him the tranquility of his days and nights, which had been much interrupted by this affair, and without which he ſhould be overwhelmed with grief.

As a proof of this, he ſaid, that it had been his intention to make a progreſs into the Eaſt, and that he had proceeded as far as Nicomedia (which was juſt after the defeat of Licinius, A. D. 324) but had been prevented from going any farther by the afflicting news of this

diſſenſion, not being able to bear the ſight of that, which it had given him ſo much pain to hear of*.

No mode of addreſs, it muſt be allowed, could have been better calculated to compoſe this difference, than this of Conſtantine, eſpecially as, at this time, he was careful not to exaſperate either of the parties by declaring himſelf in favour of one more than the other, as perhaps he might think he had unfortunately done in the caſe of the Donatiſts. And he might naturally imagine, that, after ſo much as he had done in favour of the chriſtian religion, it was not too much to expect that, in return, the miniſters of it would oblige him by living in peace with one another, eſpecially as, in his opinion, they had ſo little to contend about.

But in the eyes of the contending parties, the matter in queſtion appeared in a very different light. As Euſebius obſerves, the buſineſs was of too great magnitude to be managed by a letter; and notwithſtanding all the addreſs of the emperor, the impreſſion which a ſenſe of his merits muſt have made upon their minds, and the apprehenſion which ſome of them might have of his power, the conten-

* Euſeb. Vita Conſtant. Lib. ii. Cap. 64, &c. p. 567, &c.

tion

tion increaſed every day, till it inflamed all the provinces of the Eaſt*. If any thing in the following hiſtory can ſerve as a leſſon to princes not to interfere in the buſineſs of religion and conſcience, this may. No other prince can ever have ſo many or ſo great advantages for compoſing differences among chriſtians as Conſtantine was poſſeſſed of; but he failed of gaining his end, as all others have done ſince.

In reply to this letter of Conſtantine, Alexander addreſſed one to him, but the contents of it are not mentioned†. Arius, no doubt, wrote likewiſe. The reſult was, that Conſtantine ſummoned Arius and his friends before him, when he was attended by ſome biſhops, who were probably no friends of Arius. For Epiphanius ſays that, in this conference, Arius denied what was laid to his charge, and that Conſtantine ſaid to him, "I truſt that if "thou diſſembleſt, or denieſt any thing, thou "wilt be detected by that God whom thou "calleſt to witneſs."

It is alſo ſaid that, though Euſebius of Nicomedia did every thing that he could in fa-

* Euſeb. Vita Conſtant. Lib. ii. Cap. 73. p. 572.
† Epiph. Hær. 69. Sect. 9. Opera, Vol. 1. p. 734.

vour of Arius, the emperor ſome time after this conference wrote a long letter, addreſſed to Arius and his friends, but circulated through the empire, compoſed in the form of the moſt violent invective, in which Arius is called the very image of the devil, &c*. The whole of this letter Baronius ſays he found in Latin in the Vatican library, and he gives it at full length. It is ſo full of the groſſeſt abuſe, that if this emperor had not expreſſed himſelf in a ſimilar manner on ſimilar occaſions, as we ſhall ſee in the courſe of this hiſtory, I ſhould have concluded, without heſitation, that this letter had been compoſed by ſome of the catholic party a long time after the tranſaction; and I ſtill own that I much doubt whether Conſtantine wrote this letter, at leaſt in this ſtage of the buſineſs.

If there be any truth in what is related by Epiphanius, we muſt ſay that, by ſome means or other, Conſtantine had now taken his part, and that he was as decidedly againſt Arius, as he had been againſt Donatus, and conſequently that all that he did afterwards was only a meaſure of his own to ſuppreſs what he thought to be a faction in the church; and from this

* Epiph. Hær. 69. Sect. 9. Opera, Vol. 1. p. 734.

we

we may judge of the temper with which the holy Fathers would meet him at Nice, and what juſtice Arius had to expect from them.

SECTION V.

The Hiſtory of the Council of Nice, A. D. 325.

THE emperor, finding * that the letter which he had ſent to Alexandria had produced no good effect, and deeply reflecting within himſelf on the ſubject, determined to make another war, as Euſebius ſays, againſt the inviſible author of ſo much evil; and preſently raiſing as it were a divine phalanx againſt him, convoked a general council, ſummoning the biſhops from all quarters to attend him at Nice in Bythinia, as ſpeedily as poſſible, and furniſhing them, at the expence of the ſtate, with every convenience for their journies. Upon this, he ſays, the hope of advantage, the convenience of the preſent peace, and the deſire of ſeeing ſo great an emperor, made them ruſh from their homes as chariots from a goal. Going, therefore,

* Euſeb. Vita Conſtant. Cap. 5. p. 529.

with ſo much eagerneſs to ſee the emperor, and with the hope of ſuch favours as he alone could confer, there can be no doubt with reſpect to the previous diſpoſitions of theſe biſhops to comply with his wiſhes, whenever they ſhould be known to them.

On this ſummons the chief of the biſhops, ſays Euſebius (but by what rule the ſelection was made does not appear) flocked to Nice from all quarters of the Roman empire, from all the provinces of Aſia Minor, from Thrace, Macedonia, Achaia, and Epirus; from Cilicia, Syria, Phenicia, Arabia, Paleſtine, Egypt, Thebais, Lybia, Meſopotamia; one from Perſia; one, or perhaps more, from Sicily, and one from Spain, viz. the celebrated Hoſius. The biſhop of Rome could not attend on account of his age, but he ſent preſbyters to ſupply his place. In all, Euſebius ſays, there were above two hundred and fifty biſhops; that the preſbyters, deacons, acolyths, and others, were without number, and that they were all entertained at the expence of the emperor*.

* Euſeb. Vita Conſtant. Lib. iii. Cap. 7, 8, p. 579, &c. Conſidering the great number of biſhops in the chriſtian church at this time, two hundred and fifty, or three hundred and eighteen, as they are more commonly reckoned, was but a ſmall proportion of the whole, and

On the day appointed for the holding of the council, the biſhops and all the inferior

and is a circumſtance that gives ſome degree of credit to the very different account given by Eutychius, who is ſaid to have compiled his annals from the archives of the church of Alexandria. He ſays there were two thouſand and forty-eight biſhops aſſembled at Nice, and that Conſtantine, having heard their opinions, which were very various, but approving that of the three hundred and eighteen who held the ſame doctrine, he appointed them to meet in a large room, and gave them power to make decrees. The ſame account Selden, the publiſher of Eutychius, found in an Arabian and chriſtian writer named Joſeph, and alſo in a celebrated Mahometan hiſtorian, Iſmael Ebn Ali.

This account Beauſobre thinks may be reconciled with that given by the Greek writers, if it be ſuppoſed that the biſhops of villages, preſbyters, and thoſe who were deemed to be heretical, were not allowed to have a ſeat with the reſt. Wormius ſays, that no ſectary was allowed to give his opinion in that council. Hiſtoire de Manicheiſme, vol. i. p. 531.

Mr. Gibbon, collecting the account from Bingham, and others, ſays that the catholic church was governed by eighteen hundred biſhops, of whom a thouſand were ſeated in Greece, and eight hundred in the Latin provinces of the empire. Hiſt. Vol. ii. p. 213. And beſides theſe, the number of *choroepiſcopi*, or village biſhops, muſt at that time have been very great. According to Bingham (Summary, Vol. i. p. 298) Baſil ſome time after, had fifty of them under him; and, as Euſebius ſays, that preſbyters, &c. without number attended, thoſe could not ſurely be excluded. That theſe preſbyters, however, had no votes is evident, becauſe the decrees were ſigned by no other than three hundred and eighteen biſhops; and if they retired without making any remonſtrances, that have come down to us, the inferior biſhops may have done the ſame.

clergy

clergy above-mentioned, were aſſembled in the largeſt room in the palace, rows of ſeats being placed on each ſide of it; and all having taken their places, they waited ſtanding in reſpectful ſilence for the emperor, who, being preceded by ſeveral of his friends, at length made his appearance, as Euſebius ſays, like an angel of God, exceeding all his attendants in ſize, gracefulneſs, and ſtrength, and dazzling all eyes with the ſplendor of his dreſs; but ſhewing the greateſt humility and modeſty in his manner of walking, geſture, and behaviour. Having taken his ſtation in the middle of the upper part of the room, near a low chair that was covered with gold, he did not ſit down till the Fathers deſired it.

All being now ſeated, the biſhop, ſays Euſebius, whoſe place was the firſt at the right hand of the emperor (meaning, it is probable, himſelf)* roſe; and addreſſing the emperor, gave thanks to God on his account, probably congratulating the church on its proſperous condition, brought about by his means. Then he ſitting down, the emperor himſelf addreſſed the company in Latin, expreſſing his happineſs in ſeeing them all met on ſo glorious

* Some think that it was Euſtathius, who was firſt biſhop of Beræa, and afterwards of Antioch, who made this ſpeech.

an

an occaſion as the amicable ſettlement of all their differences, which, he ſaid, had given him more concern than all his wars; but that all theſe being at an end, he had nothing more at heart than to be the means of ſettling the peace of the church; and he concluded with expreſſing his earneſt wiſh that they would, as ſpeedily as poſſible, remove every cauſe of diſſenſion, and lay the foundation of a laſting peace. What he ſaid in Latin was interpreted to the Fathers in Greek.

Immediately after this ſpeech, this excellent emperor was witneſs to a ſcene which muſt have afforded him a very unpromiſing proſpect as to the ſucceſs of his project for peace. For before they entered upon the diſcuſſion of any thing that related to the great object of their meeting, the biſhops began with complaining to the emperor of each other, and vindicating themſelves; but of what kind theſe mutual accuſations were, our author does not ſay, but only that to every thing that was ſaid the emperor gave a patient hearing, and that by his mildneſs and great addreſs, ſpeaking to them in Greek (which he was in ſome meaſure able to do) he at length prevailed upon them to come to an agreement, not only, adds our author, with

reſpect

reſpect to their private differences, but alſo with reſpect to the two great objects of their aſſembling, viz. the rule of faith (meaning what related to the Arian controverſy) and the time of celebrating Eaſter *. This implies that the emperor attended all the debates of the council, which continued a conſiderable time, and that he took an active part in them.

Socrates ſays that the biſhops, having put into the emperor's hands written libels, containing their complaints againſt each other, he threw them all together into the fire, adviſing them, according to the doctrine of Chriſt, to forgive one another, as they hoped to be forgiven themſelves †. Sozomen ſays, that the biſhops having made their complaints in perſon, the emperor bade them reduce them all into writing, and that on the day which he had appointed to conſider them, he ſaid, as he threw all the billets unopened into the fire, that it did not belong to him to decide the differences of chriſtian biſhops, and that the hearing of them muſt be deferred till the day of judgment ‡. According to any of theſe

* Euſeb. Vita Conſtant. Lib. iii. Cap. 13, 14. p. 584.
† Hiſt. Lib. i. Cap. 8. p. 20.
‡ Hiſt. Lib. i. Cap. 17. p. 35.

accounts, the ſtory gives us a favourable opinion of the emperor, but a very unfavourable one of theſe chriſtian biſhops, who, after a time of grievous perſecution, had learned no more of the chriſtian temper than they appear to have done, and whoſe mutual animoſities were ſo great, that they could not prevent them from breaking out on this ſolemn occaſion, in the preſence of the emperor himſelf.

When the chief ſubject, for the deciſion of which they were aſſembled, came to be debated, the principal perſons who appeared on the ſide of Arius, who was alſo preſent himſelf, were Euſebius of Nicomedia, Theognis of Nice, and Maris of Chalcedon; and the perſon who chiefly oppoſed them, and who will make a great figure in the ſubſequent part of this hiſtory, was Athanaſius, then only a deacon of the church of Alexandria, but much confided in by Alexander the biſhop. But it is probable that in this, as in almoſt every other public tranſaction, every thing of conſequence was previouſly ſettled by the principal actors, who were in the confidence of the emperor.

According to Philoſtorgius, Alexander biſhop of Alexandria, and Hoſius of Corduba (who

(who is well known to have been in the good graces of the emperor) meeting with ſome others at Nicomedia, ſettled among themſelves, that in the enſuing council, Chriſt ſhould be declared to be *conſubſtantial* with the Father, and that Arius ſhould be baniſhed *.

It is ſaid that after the Fathers in this council had debated ſome time in the forms of logic, a plain layman, a confeſſor, ſtood up, and obſerved that Chriſt and the apoſtles did not ſpeak in this manner, but preached faith and good works; and by this he is ſaid to have ſilenced the logicians. But certainly they had occaſion for all their logic to compoſe ſuch a creed as they at length determined upon. In what manner the debate proceeded till they came to this agreement is not known, but the creed itſelf, as far as we are at preſent concerned in it, is as follows:

"I believe in one God, the Father, Al-
" mighty, maker of heaven and earth, and of
" all things viſible and inviſible; and in one
" Lord Jeſus Chriſt, the only begotten Son of
" God, begotten of his Father before all
" worlds, God of God, Light of Light, very
" God of very God, begotten not made,

* Hiſt. Lib. i. Cap. 7. p. 478.

" being

" being of one ſubſtance with the Father, by " whom all things were made, &c."

To this creed was ſubjoined the following anathema, " The catholic and apoſtolic church " of God anathematizes thoſe who ſay that " there ever was a time when the Son was not, " or that he did not exiſt before he was gene- " rated, or that he was made out of nothing, " or out of any other ſubſtance, or that he is " ſubject to change *."

The clauſes in this creed which are particularly oppoſed to the opinions of Arius are thoſe which aſſert that Chriſt was not properly *made*, ſo as to come under the denomination of a *creature*, but that he was *begotten*; and that his eſſence or ſubſtance was the very ſame with that of the Father himſelf. By their aſſerting that he was *begotten before all worlds* they alſo probably meant to decide againſt Arius, who ſaid that there was a time when the Son was not. But, as I have obſerved already, the phraſe is indeterminate, ſince it may not expreſs a proper eternity, but only the indefinite ſpace before the commencement of what they call *time*, or the creation of the world. At the ſame time, by ſaying that Chriſt was only

* Niceph. Hiſt. Lib. 8. Cap. 17. p. 568.

God

God of God, and *light of light*, the Fathers of this council ſhew that, in their opinion, his divinity was derived from the Father, and that he was not (αναιτιος) *without origin*, or (αυτοθεος) *God of himſelf*, as the Father was; ſo that they had no idea at this time of Chriſt being properly *equal* to the Father. We ſhall not find this language, or any thing equivalent to it, till a later period in our hiſtory.

This famous creed was ſigned by three hundred and eighteen biſhops. Philoſtorgius ſays that Secundus of Ptolemais, who with Theonas biſhop of Marmarica refuſed from the firſt to ſubſcribe the Nicene creed, told Euſebius of Nicomedia, that he had ſubſcribed only for fear of baniſhment; but that God had revealed to him that notwithſtanding this, he would be baniſhed within a year; and accordingly three months after this, Euſebius was baniſhed*. As the orthodox made great boaſts of their miracles, we ſee that the Arians alſo were not without pretenſions of the ſame kind.

Euſebius of Nicomedia, Theognis of Nice, Maris of Chalcedon, Theonas of Marmarica, Secundus of Ptolemais, Menophantus of Epheſus, Patrophilus of Scythopolis, and Narciſſus of Neconias, a city of the ſecond

* Hiſt. Lib. 1. Cap. 9, 10. p. 478.

Cilicia,

afterwards called Irenopolis*, the friends of Arius, being desirous that their resolutions might be unanimous, presented a creed, in which no use was made of the term *consubstantial*, but which, in every other respect, expressed the sentiments of the enemies of Arius. They had no objection to saying the Christ was a *true God*, *God of God*, or that he was *not a creature*, but the *power and wisdom of the Father*, his *eternal image*, *like to the Father*, and *unchangeable*.

But Athanasius and his friends, supposing that they did this on the idea that all these expressions might be used with respect to a man; and with a view to cut off all their subterfuges, that is, in fact, intending to express themselves in such a manner as they knew that the other party could not concur with them, with great indignation tore the paper on which it was written, and introduced that obnoxious term †; though they acknowledged it not to be a scripture phrase; alleging, that their adversaries also made use of expressions which were not to be found in the scrip-

* Niceph. Lib. viii. Cap. 18. Vol. i. p. 569.

† That the enemies of Arius introduced this term, as one that the Arians could not adopt, is acknowledged by Ambrose, De Fide, Lib. iii. Cap. 7. Opera Vol. iii. p. 159. However, meaning as they did to condemn

tures, as that the Son was made *out of nothing*, &c. Willing, however, to agree with their brethren, and dreading, no doubt, the reſentment of the emperor, whoſe diſpoſition and reſolution were by this time ſufficiently apparent, they all conſented to admit that term, except Theonas of Marmarica, and Secundus of Ptolemais, who were therefore excommunicated along with Arius*.

Euſebius of Cæſarea heſitated, but at length he ſubſcribed the creed; and when he ſent a copy of it to his church, he explained the meaning of the word at which he had demurred; ſaying that by *conſubſtantial* was not meant that Chriſt was any part of the Father, ſo as to imply that the Father was corporeal, and had been divided. He alſo ſaid that by the phraſe *begotten, not made*, was only meant

the doctrine of Arius, there was no other way of doing it, than by ſuch language as the Arians could not adopt. To compoſe a creed which all parties might equally ſubſcribe, would have anſwered no purpoſe at all. The ſcriptures would then have been ſufficient. It would have been happy, indeed, if this would have ſatisfied the contending parties; but for this purpoſe there would have been no occaſion for the council of Nice. Being aſſembled for a particular purpoſe, it was conſiſtent not to ſeparate without gaining that purpoſe. They would elſe have incurred the ridicule of their adverſaries.

* Niceph. Hiſt. Lib. viii. Cap. 21. Vol. i. p. 571, from the writings of Euſtathius and Athanaſius.

that

that Chriſt was of a nature different from that of thoſe creatures which he himſelf had made, and more excellent than they. That theſe phraſes were to be underſtood in theſe ſenſes, was, he ſaid, the opinion of the emperor, and of the Fathers themſelves. As to the *anathema*, he ſaid it was nothing more than a condemnation of all unſcriptural phraſes, which had produced almoſt all the confuſion and ſedition in churches *.

However, as the two biſhops above mentioned were not able to ſatisfy themſelves in this manner, and therefore refuſed to ſubſcribe the creed; and as the council ordered that Arius, and all who thought as he did, ſhould be excommunicated, and that he ſhould not be permitted to enter Alexandria; the emperor, in giving his ſanction to their decrees, ſent both of them, as well as Arius himſelf, and the reſt of his adherents, among whom was Euzoius, into baniſhment †.

In this council it was alſo decided, and, as far as appears, unanimouſly, that Eaſter ſhould be obſerved not in the Jewiſh manner, on the fourteenth day of the month, but on the Sunday following the firſt full moon after the

* Niceph. Hiſt. Lib. viii. Cap. 22. p. 578. 583.
† Socratis Hiſt. Lib. i. Cap. 8. p. 22.

vernal equinox, which had been the cuſtom of all the weſtern churches. Even this want of uniformity in the practice of chriſtians had given ſerious diſturbance to the mind of Conſtantine, who had conceived that the chriſtian religion would not appear to advantage with this variety in the cuſtoms of its profeſſors.

We have ſeen, in the account of the origin of the monks, that ſuperſtition had already given uncommon merit to ſeveral acts of auſterity, and eſpecially to celibacy. By this time the idea of a kind of impurity was annexed to the commerce of the ſexes, and it was thought particularly unſuitable to the clerical character. At this ſolemn council it was propoſed, that thoſe who ſhould be choſen biſhops, preſbyters, or deacons, after they were married, ſhould from that time abſtain from all commerce with their wives. But this propoſal was over-ruled by Paphnutius, a biſhop in Upper Thebais, and an old confeſſor, one of whoſe eyes had been put out in the late perſecution, and whom, on that account, the emperor held in high veneration. Marriage, ſaid this venerable old man, is honourable in all, and the bed undefiled, and commerce with a lawful wife is real chaſtity. He added, that the chaſtity of the divorced

wives

wives would be in danger, and it was ſufficient that a man ſhould not be permitted to marry after he ſhould be choſen into the body of the clergy. To this all aſſented, and Paphnutius was allowed to have the more merit on this occaſion, as he had never been married, and being educated a monk, had diſtinguiſhed himſelf by his perfect chaſtity *.

The great object of this council being to put an end to all differences of opinion or practice among chriſtians, and, as far as poſſible, to prevent all diſſenſion in future, the members of it came to a deciſion concerning the Meletians, and to appearance with a great proſpect of ſucceſs. For Meletius himſelf acceded to their deciſion, which was, that he ſhould remain at Lycopolis, with the title of a biſhop, but without the functions, and that all thoſe who had been ordained by him ſhould be re-ordained to the ſame rank by other biſhops.

Another great object of the council was to ſettle the rights of the biſhops of different ſees; and it was agreed that every biſhop ſhould be ordained by at leaſt three of the biſhops of the ſame province, and that the election ſhould be confirmed by the biſhop of

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. i. Cap. 11. p. 38.

the metropolis. This was regulated according to the diviſion of provinces in the Roman empire, and ſeems to be explained by another canon of this council, which ſays, that to the biſhop of Alexandria is given the ſuperintendency of Egypt, Lybia, and the Pentapolis, according to ancient cuſtom; and that a ſimilar juriſdiction is given to the ſees of Antioch, of Rome, and the chief cities of the other provinces. From this it is evident, that no particular preference was yet given to the ſee of Rome. It is ſaid, indeed, that particular honour ſhould be given to the biſhop of Jeruſalem, ſaving the honour that is due to the metropolis. But by this was probably meant either Antioch, or Cæſarea, the metropolis of the province in which Jeruſalem was.

With reſpect to the Novatians, it was agreed that, if they returned to the catholic church, the rank of their clergy ſhould be preſerved, provided it did not interfere with that of the other clergy of the place; ſo that a biſhop was to become a preſbyter, &c.

Among other incidents attending this celebrated council, Socrates gives an account of a converſation between the emperor and Aceſius, a biſhop of the Novatians who attended it, and for whom he had a particular reſpect.

Being

Being aſked by the emperor whether he had any objection to the decrees of the council, he ſaid he had none. Why then, ſaid the emperor, do you ſeparate yourſelf from the communion of your brethren? To this the biſhop replied by reciting the hiſtory of the perſecution of Decius, at which time his ſect commenced, and by obſerving that, in their ideas, any ſin committed after baptiſm was what the apoſtle John calls *the ſin unto death*, and therefore that, though thoſe perſons who are guilty of ſuch ſins ſhould be exhorted to repent of them, that they might obtain forgiveneſs of God, they ought not to be received into the communion of the church. On this the emperor pleaſantly ſaid, "Erect a "ladder then, Aceſius, up to heaven, and "mount it alone."

At this time, though the Novatians had many churches in Aſia Minor, and the neighbourhood of Conſtantinople, as well as in other places, and eſpecially in Africa; yet, as they were peaceably diſpoſed, the emperor might not apprehend much inconvenience from ſo ſmall a breach in the unity of the church. Beſides, his own mind muſt have been impreſſed with ideas very ſimilar to thoſe of the Novatians. For

nothing elſe could lead a profeſſed chriſtian to defer baptiſm till near the hour of death, which himſelf, and many others in that age did*.

With reſpect to the followers of Paulus Samoſatenſis, it was ordained that, if they returned to the catholic church, they ſhould be re-baptized, evidently becauſe they did not baptize *in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt*, but generally *in the name of Chriſt* only, which was not deemed to be a valid baptiſm. Theſe unitarians, no doubt, believed that much ſuperſtition was kept up by the uſual form of baptiſm, and that it was not the original method of adminiſtering it by the apoſtles themſelves.

The other canons of this celebrated council relate to inferior articles of diſcipline. When the whole was concluded, the members of it addreſſed a letter to the church of Alexandria, and to the churches of Egypt, Lybia, and Pentapolis, giving them an account of their determinations. In this they obſerved, that the firſt queſtion related to the impiety and perverſeneſs of Arius and his aſſociates, and informed them that they had agreed that his impious and blaſphemous opinion ſhould be ana-

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. i. Cap. 10. p. 35.

thematized

thematized, that they had not even had patience to hear his impiety, madneſs, and blaſphemy; but that he had received the reward worthy of his wickedneſs, &c. alluding to his baniſhment. They then give an account of the principal of their other proceedings, and conclude with congratulating them on the extinction of hereſy, and deſiring their prayers for the permanence of their regulations*.

Conſtantine himſelf wrote three letters upon this occaſion, one addreſſed to all the churches, acquainting them with the reaſons of his calling the council, in which he ſays he had acted as one of their body, and their fellow ſervant, and that now there was no more room left for diſſenſion, or controverſy concerning the faith†. So little did this great man know of human nature, and ſo little could he ſee into futurity! In the ſame letter he gives an account of the proceedings of the council with reſpect to the uniform celebration of the feſtival of Eaſter.

His ſecond letter is addreſſed to the church of Alexandria, congratulating them on the removal of all error, and the reſtoration of unanimity in all the churches; obſerving that he conſidered himſelf as one of them, and that he

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. i. Cap. 9. p. 26.

† Euſeb. Vita Conſtant. Lib. iii. Cap. 17. p. 586.

alſo

alſo had examined into the truth. He then mentions the impudent blaſphemies of that impudent miniſter of the devil, and enemy of the truth, Arius; and ſays, that the deciſion of three hundred biſhops, who had been aſſembled on this occaſion muſt be the deciſion of God himſelf. He concludes with exhorting them to return to the way of truth, and commends them to the divine keeping*.

The third letter is addreſſed to the biſhops and people. It is full of the ſame invectives againſt Arius, treating him as another Porphyry, the declared enemy of chriſtianity, and deſiring that his followers might be called Porphyrians. He moreover orders that the writings of Arius ſhould be burned, in order that no monument of them might be left to poſterity, and declares that, if any perſon ſhould find any book of Arius, and not immediately burn it, he ſhould be put to death†. This is the firſt caſe of death being threatened by any chriſtian magiſtrate for any thing relating to hereſy; and it is ſo manifeſtly abſurd and extravagant, that ſurely it can be no recommendation of ſuch unchriſtian conduct.

Before Conſtantine diſmiſſed the fathers of this council, as twenty years of his reign were

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. i. Cap. 9. p. 30.
† Ibid. p. 21.

then

then juſt completed, from the time that his father died, and the period was celebrated with much feſtivity in all the provinces, he invited all the biſhops to an entertainment in the palace, when ſome of them dined with the emperor himſelf, and others in rooms particularly prepared for them, ſo that nothing being wanting in point of reſpect and attention, it ſeemed to theſe good Fathers, juſt being emerged from perſecution, to be, as our hiſtorian ſays, an image of the reign of Chriſt upon earth, and appeared more like a dream than a reality.

The emperor alſo made preſents to each of the biſhops according to their rank; and when he took his leave of them, he addreſſed them in a ſpeech, in which he exhorted them to live in peace with one another, not to envy one another on account of any ſuperior endowments which ſome of them might poſſeſs, and to forgive their mutual injuries, leſt they ſhould expoſe themſelves to the ridicule of the heathens. He concluded with deſiring their prayers for himſelf*.

* Euſeb. Vita Conſtant. Lib. iii. Cap. 15. p. 585.

SECTION VI.

From the Council of Nice A. D. 325, *to the Death of Arius*, A. D. 336.

THOUGH this good emperor flattered himſelf that his great labour, addreſs, and expence, on occaſion of this celebrated council, had not been in vain, and had hoped that, by means of it, an end would be put to all diſſenſion in the chriſtian world, he ſoon had reaſon to ſee (whether he actually ſaw it or not) that neither kings nor councils are omnipotent, and that there is ſomething in the mind of man that oppoſes itſelf to arbitrary authority, by whomſoever it is uſurped. This appeared with reſpect to every article of conſequence that had been decided by this council.

The Arians in Egypt were far from being pacified. It has indeed been ſeen, that they were treated with too much haughtineſs and contempt to be diſpoſed to conciliation, or ſubmiſſion. The emperor, provoked at this refractorineſs, ſummoned ſome of them before

fore him, to reprove them; and what provoked him the more was, that Euſebius of Nicomedia, and Theognis of Nice received thoſe very Arians into their communion. A ſynod being held on the ſubject, theſe two biſhops were depoſed, and Conſtantine baniſhed them into Gaul. This was within three months after the holding of the council, and they continued in this ſtate of exile three years.

In order to juſtify his conduct, Conſtantine wrote to the church of Nicomedia, explaining the reaſons of his proceeding, moreover accuſing Euſebius of treaſonable practices with reſpect to himſelf, and of favouring Arius in the council, which he ſays he had called in order to expel the miſchief to which the madneſs of Arius had given riſe. He concludes with adviſing the churches of Nicomedia and Nice to chuſe good and orthodox biſhops in the place of thoſe who had been depoſed*. From the tenor of this letter we may eaſily perceive what had been the ſtate of free diſcuſſion in the preceding council.

As Euſebius was always conſidered as the head of the Arian party, it is not impoſſible that this circumſtance, of his being ſuppoſed

* Theod. Hiſt. Lib. i. Cap. 20. p. 49.

to

to have favoured the enemies of Conſtantine, might have great weight in his mind in taking ſo determined a part as he did againſt Arius. For neither long before, nor long after, the council, did Conſtantine appear to ſhew much zeal for the queſtion in diſpute. His object was to reconcile the oppoſite parties, and by any means to preſerve the peace of the church.

When Conſtantine acted with ſo high hand in procuring the condemnation of Arius and his doctrine, he little foreſaw the change that would take place in his own mind with reſpect to them. The change, however, is remarkable, and hiſtorians account for it in the following manner. A preſbyter, whoſe name does not appear, had the confidence of Conſtantia, the ſiſter of the emperor, and who had been married to Licinius. By him ſhe had been brought to think well of Arius and his friends, and upon her death-bed ſhe earneſtly recommended him to her brother, who had a great affection for her; and this preſbyter perſuaded the emperor that both the conduct and the faith of Arius had been much miſrepreſented by his enemies.

Upon this Conſtantine (ſuppoſed to be A. D. 330) ſent for Arius from the place of his baniſhment, whither Euzoius, a deacon of the

church of Alexandria, who had alſo been depoſed by the biſhop, had accompained him *. After ſome conference, by which it is probable that the emperor was ſtill more diſpoſed to favour him, Arius preſented a confeſſion of his faith, in which he profeſſed his belief that the Son was *begotten of the Father before all ages*, and expreſſed his hope that, as this ſimple faith was the doctrine of the church, and agreeable to the ſcriptures, he might be re-admitted into communion without entering into matters of doubtful diſputation †.

With this Conſtantine was ſatisfied. But not taking upon himſelf to do what belonged to the clergy, he ſent him to a number of biſhops, who were then aſſembled at Jeruſalem, upon occaſion of opening a new church there, deſiring them to examine his faith, and if they had no objection to it, to receive him and Euzoius into communion with them. He alſo requeſted that they would inform the church of Alexandria, and all the churches of Egypt, Lybia, and Thebais, of their ſentiments on this ſubject, and exhort them to give Arius and his friend a cordial reception among them ‡.

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. i. Cap. 25. p. 60.
† Ibid Sect. 26. p. 61.
‡ Ibid Lib. ii. Cap. 27. p. 83.

It is pretty evident from this tranſaction, that Conſtantine was now returned to the ſame ſtate of mind in which he had been before the council; thinking that the queſtion which had been agitated with ſo much warmth was of very little importance. His reſentment was therefore now turned againſt thoſe who had diſturbed the peace of the church for ſuch a trifle; and as Arius was willing to communicate with his adverſaries, notwithſtanding their difference of opinion, he thought that they acted a more unchriſtian part than he.

Before this time, viz. A. D. 328, Euſebius and Theognis, declaring that, having conſidered the import of the word *conſubſtantial*, they did not object to *it*, but to the *anathema* pronounced by the council (becauſe, having known Arius very well, they were ſatisfied that he was not deſerving of ſuch a cenſure) they were recalled from baniſhed, and reinſtated in their reſpective ſees, which had been occupied by other perſons; and Euſebius having great influence with the emperor, had no doubt uſed his good offices in favour of Arius. By his means, alſo, the Meletians were brought into favour with the emperor, and allowed to hold their ſeparate congrega-

tions, in which they had been disturbed by the violence of Alexander bishop of Alexandria.

The Arians succeeded also in deposing a bishop who had been exceedingly hostile to them, viz. Eustathius, who had been removed from the see of Beræa, to that of Antioch, and who, at the council of Nice, had been so much the enemy of the Arians, that he was by them charged with Sabellianism. On the other hand, he had accused Eusebius of Cæsarea with adulterating the Nicene creed. But Eusebius not only repelled the accusation, but charged his adversary with Sabellianism, and many bishops wrote for and against him. He was himself a considerable writer, and is by Theodoret stiled *the Great*. What made him still more obnoxious to the friends of Arius, was his having refused to admit among his clergy several persons who were of that party, as Stephen, Leontius, Eudoxius, George, Theodosius, another Eustathius, whose names will occur in the subsequent history, and others, as they have been collected by Tillemont*.

At length a synod being called at Antioch (supposed by Dr. Lardner to be about A. D.

* History of the Arians, Sect. 14.

328) Euſtathius was examined and depoſed, as a perſon who was more of a Sabellian, than a believer in the Nicene creed; but according to other accounts, he was condemned for ſome immoralities that were laid to his charge. Aſclepas of Gaza, was probably depoſed at the ſame time, and it is generally thought on the ſame account. The decree of this ſynod was followed by great diſturbances at Antioch, eſpecially when they proceeded to chuſe a new biſhop; ſome being deſirous of retaining Euſtathius, and others of having Euſebius of Cæſarea. Euſebius however declined the invitation of the party which was for him, and the emperor himſelf wrote to the people of Antioch, exhorting them to peace, and approving the reaſons which had been alleged by Euſebius for not chuſing their ſee. At the ſame time he ſpeaks of him as a perſon for whom he had the higheſt eſteem, yea, as one who was worthy of the biſhoprick of the whole world. The ſee continued vacant eight years*.

Conſtantine's letters to the people of Antioch, to Euſebius, and to the ſynod aſſembled on the occaſion, are all preſerved by Euſebius. They ſhew the greateſt anxiety

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. i. Cap. 24. p. 58.

in this well meaning emperor about preſerving the peace of the church, which had been much better ſecured by his not interferring in the buſineſs.

In the mean time Alexander biſhop of Alexandria being dead, Athanaſius had been choſen in his place; and not being diſpoſed to adopt the ſentiments of the emperor, or to pay any regard to the recommendation of the biſhops aſſembled at Jeruſalem (who had acted as the emperor wiſhed them to do) refuſed to admit Arius into communion with his church, though the emperor threatened him with depoſition and baniſhment. This obſtinacy, together with ſome accuſations, which Euſebius of Nicomedia, and other friends of Arius, had brought againſt him, induced Conſtantine to appoint a ſynod to hear him at Tyre, which was the more convenient, as it was in his way to Jeruſalem, whether he was going to the conſecration of a church which he had built there; and he hoped that when this affair was ſettled, he ſhould enjoy the feſtival without alloy. This was A. D. 335.

Athanaſius at firſt refuſed to obey the ſummons, but being threatened to be brought by force, he thought proper to comply.

About ſixty biſhops attended this ſynod, and before them he was obliged to defend himſelf. One of the charges which had been brought againſt him was, that he had cut off the hand of one Arſenius a biſhop of the Meletians. But producing Arſenius with both his hands, he ſufficiently proved his innocence. He was alſo charged with having whipped, or impriſoned, ſix other biſhops of the Meletians*. Another accuſation was that one Macarius, a perſon ſent by him to expell Iſchyras, who acted as a preſbyter in a church of Mareotis, had by his orders ruſhed upon him in a violent manner, overturning the table in his church, breaking the chalice, and burning the ſacred books. To this accuſation Athanaſius pleaded that he had no occaſion to reply, becauſe in the form of the indictment Iſchyras was ſtated to be a preſbyter, whereas it could not be proved that he was one. In this, however, he was over ruled, and the fact itſelf coming to be enquired into, it was thought proper to ſend a deputation to Mareotis to make the enquiry upon the ſpot. It conſiſted of Theognis of Nice, Maris of Chalcedon, Theodorus of Heraclea, Macedonius of Mopſueſtia, Valens of Murſa,

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. iii. Cap. 25. p.

and

and Urſacius of Singidunum. But Athanaſius ſuſpecting ſome artifice, becauſe Macarius was detained in bonds, and becauſe they were his enemies who were gone to make the inquiry, withdrew himſelf. In the mean time, the perſons who had been ſent to Egypt returned with a confirmation of the charge; and the abſconding of Athanaſius being interpreted into a confeſſion of his guilt, the ſynod pronounced the ſentence of his depoſition. But ſome of the biſhops, and among them Marcellus of Ancyra, refuſed to ſubſcribe the ſentence.

After this the biſhops who had compoſed this ſynod went to Jeruſalem, to ſolemnize the dedication of the church, and there they received Arius into communion, as a perſon who had given the emperor ſatisfaction concerning his faith; and, in a letter to the church of Alexandria, alluding to the depoſition of Athanaſius, they added, that all ground of diſunion was now removed *.

Athanaſius, on the return of the emperor to Conſtantinople, had fled to him, who was much ſurpriſed and concerned to ſee him; but as he begged to have his cauſe examined in his preſence, Conſtantine wrote to the

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. i. Cap. 29, &c p. 66, &c.

biſhops, who were ſtill at Jeruſalem, expreſſing his extreme chagrin, that while he was doing every thing in his power to promote the cauſe of chriſtianity, they ſhould be quarrelling among themſelves, and he deſired them to come without delay to Conſtantinople. Accordingly ſome of them attended, viz. Euſebius of Nicomedia, Theognis of Nice, Maris of Chalcedon, and other friends of Arius; and without repeating their former accuſations, they now charged him, on the evidence of four biſhops, with threatening to ſtop the uſual exportation of corn from Egypt to Conſtantinople, which was then in diſtreſs for want of it. On this the emperor baniſhed him to Triers in Gaul, not ſo much, it is ſaid, becauſe he believed the charge, as thinking thereby to preſerve the peace of the church, Athanaſius appearing the only obſtacle to the reſtoration of Arius and his friends *. This was A. D. 336. He continued there, or in Italy, twelve or thirteen years †.

Anthony, the famous monk of Thebais, to whom Conſtantine, out of the great reſpect that he had for him, ſometimes condeſcend-

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. i. Cap. 34, 35. p. 69, &c.
† Epiphani Hær. 68. Opera Vol. i. p. 725.

ed

ed to write, took the liberty, in return, of writing ſeveral letters to the emperor in favour of Athanaſius, entreating him that he would not pay any regard to the repreſentations of the Meletians, who had joined the party of Arius, and who were of courſe hoſtile to Athanaſius. But it was without any effect. For after this, the emperor, writing to the people of Alexandria, reproached them for their folly and levity, and aſſured them that he ſhould not change his opinion concerning Athanaſius, or recall him from baniſhment, for that he conſidered him as a ſeditious perſon, and one who had been juſtly condemned by an eccleſiaſtical ſentence.

To Anthony he replied, that he could not think lightly of the decree of the ſynod which had condemned Athanaſius; for though a few perſons might be influenced by prejudice and pique, it was not credible that ſo many biſhops, men of good character and moderation, as had concurred in this ſentence, ſhould have decided from ſuch a principle. Athanaſius, he ſaid, was abuſive and arrogant, the author of ſedition and diſcord. However, notwithſtanding Conſtantine's unconquerable averſion to Athanaſius, he would not ſuffer the ſee of Alexandria to be filled by his rival

John, who had ſucceeded Meletius, and whom the enemies of Athanaſius would have put in his place, but ſent him alſo into baniſhment *, This the emperor probably did, becauſe his being appointed a biſhop was in expreſs contradiction to the decrees of the council of Nice, according to which Meletius himſelf, indeed, was to retain the title of *biſhop*, but without the functions, and certainly without having any ſucceſſor.

There was in this reign another ſynod, called for the purpoſe of depoſing another biſhop, of a character very different from that of Athanaſius, though he had on ſome occaſions taken his part. This was Marcellus of Ancyra. The offence that he had given to the Arians, whoſe party was now prevalent, was in his anſwer to a book written by Aſterius, who had been a teacher of rhetoric in Cappadocia, and on becoming a chriſtian, had written in defence of Arianiſm, and who was much careſſed by the Arians. In his anſwer to him, Marcellus appeared to be not a proper conſubſtantialiſt, but an Unitarian, ſuch as Paulus Samoſatenſis had been, maintaining that Chriſt, in himſelf conſidered, was a mere man.

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. ii. Cap. 31. p. 89.

As

As Marcellus had attended the council of Nice, and had ſubſcribed the Nicene creed, it is probable that other unitarians had done the ſame, on the ſame principle, whatever it was. He would never have been known to have been an unitarian, if he had not been a writer. This fact, however, ſufficiently ſhews, that in this celebrated council the biſhops were far from giving their real opinions, or at leaſt from expreſſing them as they naturally would have done, if they had not been under ſome controul.

It is ſaid that, being threatened with depoſition, Marcellus promiſed to burn his book, but that when the biſhops met afterwards at Conſtantinople, A. D. 336, he refuſed to do it, and that then he was depoſed. The buſineſs was wholly conducted by the Arians, and Baſil an Arian was put in his place. The book of Marcellus is unfortunately loſt, together with every thing elſe that was written in defence of unitarianiſm in all the early ages. But we have a large anſwer to it by Euſebius, of which are preſerved many valuable extracts, in which I have availed myſelf in my *Hiſtory of early Opinions concerning Jeſus Chriſt*. In the next reign we ſhall ſee Marcellus come upon

upon the ſtage once more, and recover his ſee *.

After this, in the 31ſt year of his reign, Conſtantine, finding that Arius could not be received into the church of Alexandria without exciting dangerous tumults, ſent for him to Conſtantinople. But here alſo Alexander, the biſhop of the place, refuſed to receive him into communion, notwithſtanding all the pains that were taken by Euſebius of Nicomedia, and his friends for that purpoſe. The emperor, however, being no doubt ſatisfied both with reſpect to his faith, and his conduct (though Arius's adverſaries ſay that he impoſed upon the emperor) gave orders that he ſhould be received the next day, it being then Saturday. But it happened, that as he was was walking in the city, accompanied by his friends, he was ſuddenly ſeized with an occaſion to eaſe himſelf, and being ſhewn to a neceſſary in the neighbourhood, he was found dead in it of a *prolapſus ani*, and what the Greek phyſicians called απεφθισμα.

This event was interpreted by the catholics as a juſt judgment of God upon Arius. It was moreover ſaid by ſome to be in anſwer to

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. i. Cap. 36. p. 72.

the

the prayers of Alexander, who had ſhut himſelf up in the church, and begged of God that he would interpoſe, though it ſhould be by his own death, to prevent his receiving Arius into communion. Had Alexander himſelf died in the ſame manner, and not Arius, it would have been ſaid to have been a ſtill more exact anſwer to the ſame prayer; ſo ready are perſons to imagine not only that *men*, but that *God* alſo, thinks juſt as they do, and enters into all their reſentments*.

So much was Conſtantine changed before his death, that the Arians ſaid (and though Sozomen ſays it was a lie, I cannot think it wholly improbable) that he intended to have called another council, in order to introduce the term (ομοιουσιος) *of like ſubſtance*, for (ομουσιος) *of the ſame ſubſtance* into the creed, and that Conſtantius, who thought exactly as his father did at the time of his death, in calling the council of Ariminum did the very ſame thing that he had recommended to him†.

It is, at leaſt, highly probable, that whatever Conſtantine might really think of the perſon of Chriſt, he became diſſatisfied, as many

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. i. Cap. 37. p. 73. Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. ii. Cap. 29, 30. p. 86, &c.

† Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. iii. Cap. 19. p. 124.

others

others were, with the term *conſubſtantial*, both on account of its being unſcriptural, and of its implying not only an original, but a continued unity, ſuch as the Sabellians had maintained. It is ſaid that when Euſebius of Nicomedia was firſt accuſed to him of diſapproving this term, the biſhop ſhewed his garment, and with firmneſs replied, "If this garment "ſhould be torn into two pieces, could it be "ſaid that both the parts were *of the ſame ſub-* "*ſtance?*" The emperor made no reply, but ſeemed much diſturbed at it, finding himſelf diſappointed in his expectations of putting an end to the diſcuſſion of all queſtions of this kind*.

This was before the baniſhment of Euſebius, and is ſaid to have been the immediate cauſe of it. But as, when he recalled him, he admitted of his explanation of the term *conſubſtantial*, conſiſtent with his own ideas, and Euſebius had his confidence afterwards, and till the time of his death, while all the Conſubſtantialiſts were entirely out of favour, it is almoſt certain that, for ſome reaſon or other, he wiſhed to have that word omitted in the creed, and that he would probably have changed that term (ομοουσιος) *of the ſame ſubſtance*,

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. ii. Cap. 21. p. 32.

for

for (ομοιουσιον) *of like ſubſtance*, as leſs exceptionable, being a term that the conſubſtantialiſts themſelves could not well object to, ſince what is of the *ſame* ſubſtance with another, muſt of courſe be *like* it. The great object of Conſtantine from the firſt was merely to preſerve the unity of the church, and he probably never had much zeal for the queſtion itſelf.

SECTION VII.

Of the Meaſures of Conſtantine to ſuppreſs Hereſy.

IT is remarkable that none of the meaſures of Conſtantine to compoſe the troubles of the church, and to remove all diſſenſion from it, had complete ſucceſs, notwithſtanding all the advantages of which he was poſſeſſed; having both general councils, and power on his ſide.

Even the difference of practice in the celebration of Eaſter continued after the council of Nice. The Audeans, a ſect in Meſopotamia, ſo called from Audeus who was at the head of

of them, perſiſted in their former practice of celebrating Eaſter as they had always done, viz. at the time of the Jewiſh paſſover. The writers who treat this Audeus as a ſectary, give him the higheſt commendations for the ſtrictneſs of his morals, and ſay that he was originally driven out of the church in conſequence of the liberty that he took in reproving the irregularities of the biſhops and clergy. On this they ſay that he formed a ſeparate church, the members of which, the clergy as well as the laity, lived by the labour of their hands, and profeſſed the moſt rigid morals. As they are ſaid both to have celebrated Eaſter at the time of the Jewiſh paſſover, and alſo to have been Anthropomorphites, which many of the Jews are alſo ſaid to have been, they were probably either Jewiſh chriſtians, or, living as they did in their neighbourhood, very much influenced by them*.

The Audeans paying no regard to the deciſion of the council of Nice, which they thought to have been dictated by complaiſance for the emperor, Audeus himſelf (who is allowed to have been a venerable old man) was ſent for by Conſtantine; but not being moved by any

* Theodoret Hær. Fab. Lib. iv. Cap. 10. Opera Vol. iv. p. 241. Epiph. Hær. 70. Opera Vol. i. p. 811.

thing

thing that was ſaid to him, he was baniſhed into Scythia, where he continued many years inſtructing the Goths in the chriſtian religion; and, as it is ſaid, founding many monaſteries. In this manner has perſecution very often been the means, in the hands of divine providence, of extending the knowledge of chriſtianity. Both the Indians and the northern nations were, in an eminent manner benefited both by Diocletian's perſecution of chriſtians, and by Conſtantine's perſecution of the Arians, and other heretics.

Even the order which had been eſtabliſhed with reſpect to the rank and the prerogatives of the different ſees in the council of Nice, did not prevent all diſputes and diſturbances on that ſubject. For there was a violent contention between Acacius, who ſucceeded Euſebius in the biſhoprick of Cæſarea in Paleſtine, and Cyril biſhop of Jeruſalem, which Theodoret ſays was the cauſe of much miſchief, and that, on ſome ſlight occaſion, the latter was depoſed, and baniſhed from Jeruſalem by the former*. Cæſarea had, no doubt been the ſeat of the Roman governor; but the council had ordered that particular reſpect ſhould be paid to the

* Theodoret Hær. Fab. Lib. ii. Cap. 26. p. 109.

city

city of Jeruſalem, and had not defined that reſpect with preciſion.

It ſeems extraordinary that any chriſtians who had ſuffered ſo much, and ſo lately, by perſecution themſelves, ſhould enter ſo warmly into the perſecution of others. But this has been the caſe from the time of Conſtantine to the preſent day; and indeed was the ſame before that time, when the chriſtians had any power. Conſtantine, who had done ſo much for the church, ſeems to have thought that he had a right to regulate every thing relating to it; and though he modeſtly enough ſaid that the biſhops were judges of things *within* the church, and that he was biſhop only with reſpect to things *without it*, he muſt have thought himſelf qualified to decide who were the true and orthodox biſhops, whoſe decrees he choſe to enforce, as he ſo openly patronized ſome, and took their part ſo violently againſt others. And, what is more extraordinary, the right he aſſumed was not queſtioned.

As Conſtantine's laws reſpecting hereſy have unfortunately ſerved as a model to his ſucceſſors, I ſhall give a particular account of them, by nearly tranſlating what Euſebius has related concerning them; and, it is remarkable, that

he

he does it without the leaſt cenſure, and indeed with evident approbation. By this means we ſhall have a view of the laws themſelves, of the ſpirit by which they were drawn up, and alſo of that of the times in general.

The emperor, he ſays, having removed the diſſenſions among chriſtians, and reduced the church of God to a perfect harmony, thought it his duty entirely to extinguiſh another race of atheiſtical men, as the deadly poiſon of mankind, who were laying waſte whole cities, under the falſe appearance of modeſty and gravity, but whom our Saviour calls falſe prophets, and ravening wolves. Wherefore, having ſent orders to the governors of provinces, he expelled and diſperſed this race of men; and beſides that general law, he made a ſalutary proviſion with reſpect to the heretics by name, exhorting them to repent, and to come into the church. The following is his reſcript for this purpoſe.

"The Emperor, Conſtantine, the great, "Auguſtus, to the heretics.

"Know by this law, O ye Novatians, "Valentinians, Marcionites, Paulians, and "Cataphrygians, who all of you make up your "hereſies for your peculiar congregations; "in what lies is your folly involved, and

" with what deadly poiſons do your doctrines
" abound, ſo that the healthy are made ſick,
" and the living are brought to everlaſting
" death by your means! O ye enemies of truth,
" adverſaries of life, and counſellors of de-
" ſtruction, every thing with you is hoſtile to
" truth, and congenial to the moſt abominable
" wickedneſs, being full of abſurdity and fic-
" tion, by which you fabricate your lies.
" You afflict the innocent, and withhold
" light from the believers: continually offend-
" ing under the pretence of piety, you defile
" every thing. You wound the innocent and
" pure conſcience with deadly blows. You
" in a manner deprive the eyes of men of day-
" light. What occaſion is there to mention
" particulars. For to treat properly of your
" miſchiefs would require much time, and
" is inconſiſtent with my engagements. For
" ſo large and immenſe is your wickedneſs,
" and ſo full of all abominations, that a whole
" day would not ſuffice to deſcribe it. Be-
" ſides, we ought to turn away our ears from
" hearing ſuch things, and our eyes from ſee-
" ing them, not to defile our own ſincere and
" pure faith with the particular enumeration
" of them. Why then ſhould we any longer
" bear ſuch miſchiefs; eſpecially ſince long
" for-

" forbearance, as in a peſtilential diſorder,
" is a means of infecting thoſe who are well:
" Why then ſhould not I, as ſpeedily as poſ-
" ſible, cut up by the roots, as we may ſay, ſo
" great wickedneſs, by public animadverſion?
" Wherefore, ſince it is not poſſible to bear
" your moſt deadly and deſtructive tenets any
" longer, we declare by this law, that none of
" you preſume to hold any public aſſembly for
" the future. We have therefore given orders
" to demoliſh all the places in which you
" hold your meetings. We carry our provi-
" ſion ſo far, as to forbid ſuch aſſemblies of
" ſuperſtitious madneſs to be held not only in
" a public place, but not even in a private
" houſe. Wherefore, as is much more ho-
" nourable you who wiſh for the true and pure
" worſhip, come to the catholic church, and
" partake of its ſanctity, by which you may
" come at the truth. But let the deceit of
" your perverſe underſtanding be far removed
" from the happineſs of our times. I mean
" the accurſed and deſtructive madneſs of he-
" retics and ſchiſmatics. For it becomes me,
" on account of the happineſs which I derive
" from God, to provide that they who paſs
" their lives in good hope may be brought
" from all error into the right way, from dark-

" neſs to light, from folly to truth, from
" death to ſalvation.

" Wherefore, to give neceſſary force to
" this law, I give orders, as was ſaid before,
" that all places of aſſembly for your ſuper-
" ſtition, I mean all houſes of prayer belong-
" ing to heretics, if they can be called houſes
" of prayer, be, without appeal, taken from
" them, and immediately given to the catholic
" church, and all other places to the public,
" and that no opportunity of meeting in them
" again be allowed; that in no place, public
" or private, your unlawful aſſemblies may,
" from the preſent day be held*."

In this manner, ſays our chriſtian hiſtorian, were the heterodox diſlodged from their lurking holes by the imperial orders, and the wild beaſts themſelves, the authors of the impiety, put to flight. Of thoſe who had been deceived by them, ſome, terrified by the imperial threats, diſſembled their ſentiments, and came to the church; and ſince the laws had provided that their books ſhould be fought out, they who practiſed their forbidden arts were caught. On this account they did every thing in their power to provide for their ſafety by artifice, but others with great ſincerity came

* Euſeb. Vita Conſtant. Lib. iii. Cap. 63, &c. p. 620.

over

over to a better hope. The biſhops, making a diſtinction in theſe caſes, removed thoſe who acted hypocritically, as being only covered with ſheep's cloathing, far from the ſheep; while after a ſufficient trial they received all the ſincere converts into their churches. Thus, ſays he, they acted with reſpect to the infamous heretics. As to thoſe who had nothing impious in their tenets, but had only been ſeparated from the catholic church by factious perſons (meaning the Novatians, Donatiſts, and Audeans) they received them without heſitation. Theſe, returning in crowds, as from a diſtance, found their proper home and country in the mother church, and as returning after a long time, they came back with joy. Thus, ſays he, were the members of the common body united together in perfect harmony, and the catholic church of God, being compacted within itſelf, ſhone with peculiar ſplendour, no heretical or ſchiſmatical congregation being left; and that prince who alone was the care of God, was the ſole author of this great and ſingular benefit*.

Thus, ſays Galgacus in Tacitus, ſpeaking of the Romans, *Ubi ſolitudinem faciunt, pacem*

* Euſeb. Vita Conſtant. Lib. iii. Cap. 66. p. 622.

vocant, when they have laid all waſte by war, they call it peace. Thus Nero, and Diocletian boaſted of having exterminated the chriſtians, and Lewis XIV. the Hugonots; and the flattery and untruth were the ſame in all the caſes. Happy is it for the world, that men who have no right to judge concerning truth, and who are wholly unqualified for the office, have it not in their power to eſtabliſh what they haſtily take to be the truth, let their intentions be ever ſo good. Human nature revolts againſt uſurpation, as that muſt always be denominated which endeavours to eſtabliſh any opinion by external force. And if Conſtantine, who could boaſt ſuch ſingular merit with reſpect to the chriſtian church, was not able, with his uncontrouled power, to eſtabliſh an uniformity of opinion among his ſubjects, can we wonder at the ill ſucceſs of thoſe who have followed him in the ſame raſh enterprize?

All that *power* could do Conſtantine completely effected. The public creed was juſt what he choſe it to be, and great numbers were made to refrain from writing or ſpeaking againſt it; but private opinion was not within his reach. So popular was Arius, and his opinions, at the time of the council of Nice,

that

that there cannot be a doubt, but that if he and his friends had had the ſame influence with the emperor which thoſe of the other party had got, an Arian creed would have been the ſtandard of orthodoxy, and a *created logos* have been the ſhiboleth of the times. And had ſuch men as Marcellus and Photinus been Conſtantine's inſtructors, the plain doctrine of the ſimple humanity of Chriſt, as a man approved of God, by ſigns and wonders which God wrought by him, and whom God raiſed from the dead (which was the creed of Peter and the other apoſtles) would have had the ſame advantage of being protected by imperial power; and the whole doctrine of Chriſt being the logos, created or uncreated, of his having exiſted before the creation of the world, and of his being the inſtrument of the creation, would, I doubt not, have been treated with ridicule, as the moſt abſurd and unſcriptural jargon.

But this pure chriſtian doctrine was then, and always has been, ſaved from ſo great a diſgrace. Truth does not ſtand in need of ſuch foreign and heterogeneous ſupports. It diſdains them, conſcious of being able to do infinitely better without them. Civil power be-

gan at this time to do, and it has ever ſince continued to do, whatever it could to overthrow this *ſimple truth*. But it is founded upon a rock, and neither the power of man, nor the gates of death, can prevail againſt it.

In Conſtantine's law againſt heretics, no mention is made of the Arians, and Sozomen ſays, it was becauſe they were not then formed into ſeparate ſocieties, but held communion with the catholics. He alſo ſays that, though the other ſects ſuffered much in conſequence of this law, the emperor relaxed of its rigour with reſpect to the Novatians, who were orthodox in their belief of the Trinity, and very numerous. And Aceſius, a biſhop of that ſect at Conſtantinople, was much in favour with the emperor*.

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. ii. Cap. 32. p. 90.

SEC-

SECTION VIII.

Of the Circumſtances attending the Death of Conſtantine, A. D. 337.

CONSTANTINE built a magnificent church in Conſtantinople, and dedicated it to the twelve apoſtles, with a view that when he was dead he might be interred within it, and enjoy the benefit of the prayers that would be put up in their honour, not doubting but that he ſhould derive much advantage from them. The good diſpoſitions and intentions of this pious emperor, notwithſtanding his miſtaken policy, will, I doubt not, avail him more than his being buried in the church of the apoſtles, or than all the prayers that have been made in that place. This is an evident proof of its being the opinion of the times, that the dead might be benefited by the prayers of the living; and that all this ſhould be gravely related by one of the moſt enlightened chriſtian writers of that age, and without any cenſure, is the ſtrongeſt proof of the great growth of ſuperſtition. But this will be ſtill more evident from the laſt ſcenes of this emperor's life.

Not

Not long after Conſtantine had accompliſhed his purpoſe with reſpect to the building of this church, and his own tomb in it, he was ſeized with a diſorder which carried him off in the ſixty-ſixth year of his age, and in the thirty-firſt of his reign. He had juſt celebrated the feſtival of Eaſter with the greateſt ſplendour, when he firſt complained of a ſlight indiſpoſition; but his illneſs growing more ſerious, he had recourſe to the hot baths of the city, and then to thoſe of Helenopolis, a city ſo called from his mother Helen. This having no effect, and perceiving that he drew towards his end, he was determined to be baptized; firmly believing, as the hiſtorian ſays, that by virtue of the myſterious words of this inſtitution, the offences of his whole life would be expiated. Then, falling upon his knees, he confeſſed his ſins, and begged pardon of God. Then alſo he firſt received the impoſition of hands, with ſolemn prayers; that is, he then entered into the regular claſs of catechumens, which, according to the eſtabliſhed rules of church diſcipline, preceded baptiſm.

After this he went to the ſuburbs of Nicomedia, and having aſſembled the biſhops, he ſaid that the time was then come, when, according

cording to his moſt ardent wiſhes, and by means of their prayers, he hoped to ſecure his ſalvation. "Now," ſaid he, "is the "time when we receive that ſign which con- "fers immortality. It was my intention to "have been baptized where our Saviour him- "ſelf was baptiſed, in the river Jordan. But "God, who knows what is beſt for us, has "determined otherwiſe; and if the arbiter of "life and death ſhould prolong my life, and "I be permitted to join your chriſtian aſſem- "blies, and partake of your prayers, I pro- "miſe to obſerve thoſe rules of life which "ſhall be worthy of God."

When he had ſaid this, he was baptized in the uſual forms, was clothed with white garments, and reclined on a white bed. After his baptiſm (which he had, no doubt, deferred till this period from the ſuperſtitious idea of its efficacy to waſh away ſin, and of the impoſſibility of receiving ſo complete a purification more than once, or by any other means) he would have nothing more to do with purple, but was always dreſſed in the white garment, which the ſuperſtition of the times had preſcribed as the emblem of purity.

When he firſt put on this dreſs, he gave thanks to God with a loud voice, calling himſelf

ſelf happy, as being then qualified for immortal life, and thoſe miſerable who were deprived of ſuch a bleſſing. When his military officers lamented their condition, in being deprived of him, and wiſhed him a longer life, he replied that he then only attained the true life, that he alone knew beſt what bleſſings he partook of, and that he did not wiſh to defer his departure to God any longer. All this was tranſacted in Pentecoſt, and on the laſt day of this feſtival, which was Monday, he expired, A. D. 337 *.

Euſebius deſcribes at large the grief of all ranks of people at Conſtantinople, at Rome, and through the whole empire, upon the death of this extraordinary man, and alſo the ceremonies of his funeral, which was conducted by his ſecond ſon Canſtantius. He had depoſited his laſt will in the hands of that Arian preſbyter whom his ſiſter Conſtantia recommended to him, and who enjoyed his favour to the laſt; and this preſbyter had delivered it to Conſtantius, who was neareſt to him at the time of his death. He was buried as he wiſhed to be, in the church of the twelve apoſtles.

* Euſeb. Vita Conſtant. Lib. iv. Cap. 1, &c. p. 660, &c.

According

According to the common rules of eſtimating happineſs, Conſtantine may be pronounced to have been one of the happieſt of all his predeceſſors, from the time of the commencement of the Roman empire. He was never defeated in any one of the many battles that he fought. He triumphed over all his rivals, and, except the feeble attempts of Licinius, enjoyed a long reign, uninterrupted by foreign wars, or internal rebellions, and of greater length than that of any of the emperors ſince Auguſtus. In ſhort, he ſucceeded in every thing, excepting one project, which to him could not well have appeared impracticable, viz. to put an end to all differences among a ſet men whom he had reſcued from a ſtate of grievous perſecution, and who, owing their ſafety to him, he might preſume would, out of gratitude, ſacrifice to him, if not their private opinions, at leaſt their animoſities, and be contented to live eaſy and happy under him.

The purity of Conſtantine's intentions, an d the ſincerity of his piety, cannot be doubted; and though he was ſuperſtitious, he was not more ſo than ſome of the wiſeſt men of his time appear to have been; every thing which wears that aſpect about him being related not only

only without cenſure, but with entire approbation, by all the hiſtorians who have recorded them. Beſides, why ſhould we eſteem chriſtian ſuperſtition, in the caſe of Conſtantine, more reproachful than that of the heathen emperors, Trajan, Marcus Antoninus, and Julian, who are generally thought to have been great men notwithſtanding? They certainly were not deſtitute either of good ſenſe, or ſtrength of mind, with reſpect to the common conduct of life, or the affairs of the empire; and if we judge by events, we muſt pronounce Conſtantine to have been as great a man as any of them.

So great was the piety of Conſtantine, that he converted his palace into a kind of church, by introducing a regular religious ſervice into it*. He likewiſe preſcribed a form of devotion for the army every Lord's-day †. But his ſuperſtition appeared in ordering the ſign of the croſs to be put upon their ſhields. He ordered the Lord's-day, and likewiſe Friday (the former being a feſtival, and the latter a faſt among the more zealous chriſtians) to be kept holy, by abſtaining from labour ‡. He had ſtated hours for his own private de-

* Euſeb. Vita. Conſtant. Lib. iv. Cap. 17. p. 634.
† Ibid. Cap. 19, 20. p. 636. ‡ Ibid. Cap. 18. p. 635.

votions.

votions. Eaſter he celebrated with particular ſolemnity, and on the preceding vigil the whole city was illuminated with columns of lamps, which gave a light almoſt approaching to day *.

It could not be ſuppoſed that Conſtantine ſhould be exempt from the prejudice in favour of celibacy, which appears to have prevailed among all chriſtians of his time. He ſhewed it by giving unmarried perſons of both ſexes, even when they were under age, the power of making a will, which was in favour of thoſe who devoted themſelves to a ſingle life for the ſake of religion †.

Great men have generally had great faults, and Conſtantine was certainly not free from them. If ambition be a crime, perhaps no conqueror, or founder of a great family, can be ſaid to have been innocent; and the deſire of acquiring dominion is neceſſarily accompained with jealouſy in keeping poſſeſſion of it; and in more caſes than that of Conſtantine this jealouſy has been excited towards thoſe who have had it moſt in their power to ſeize it, though they have been their ſons or brothers.

* Euſeb. Vita Conſtant. Lib. iv. Cap. 22. p. 637.
† Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. i. Cap. 9. p. 21.

Unfortunately,

Unfortunately, Conſtantine was led, probably by the inſinuations of artful and ill-deſigning perſons, eſpecially his wife Fauſta, to ſee his ſon Criſpus by a former wife in this dangerous light. He is ſaid to have been an accompliſhed youth, and to have been greatly aſſiſting to his father in his victories over Licinius, and on this account to have been very popular in the empire. The conſequence, however, was the death of Criſpus, and his friends, among whom was the ſon of Licinius by his ſiſter. But we ought not to condemn Conſtantine till we have certain proofs of the innocence of Criſpus; and the ſubject is now covered with impenetrable darkneſs.

That Conſtantine was not ſo prone to jealouſy and cruelty as many conquerors have been, is evident from his brothers being not only permitted to live, but to enjoy the moſt honourable ſtations in the empire; and the laſt fourteen years of his life, in which the government of the provinces was committed to thoſe who were the next in order of ſucceſſion to it, were paſſed without any ſymptoms of jealouſy, and with the moſt intire and well placed confidence. The temper of Conſtantine

tine was naturally ſo far from being cruel, that he was charged with the oppoſite extreme of too great indulgence to thoſe who acted under him.

SECTION IX.

Of Conſtantine's Converſion to Chriſtianity.

AFTER having gone over the reigns of ſo many heathen and perſecuting emperors, it is natural to enquire into the cauſes of Conſtantine's becoming a chriſtian; eſpecially as the chriſtianity of his ſucceſſors, which gave an entire new turn to all the ſubſequent hiſtory of the Roman empire, and in a manner to that of the world, was, in a great meaſure the natural conſequence of it. As we have no other account of this change than that which Euſebius has given us, as from the emperor himſelf, confirmed, as he ſays, by a ſolemn oath, I muſt lay it before my readers.

He told Euſebius, that after the death of his father, when he was marching againſt Maxentius, being ſenſible that he ſtood in need of ſome aſſiſtance beſides that which his troops

could give him (eſpecially as his adverſaries had called to their aſſiſtance various magical arts and charms, which derived all their power from the heathen gods) and that the help which he wanted muſt come from ſome god or other, to whoſe providence arms are only ſubſervient, he conſidered with himſelf the confidence and the faith of the ſeveral emperors who had preceded him, and compared them with thoſe of his father. They had put their truſt in a multitude of gods, whom they had endeavoured to render propitious to them by ſacrifices and donations; but though their oracles had promiſed them every thing, they had all come to an untimely end. On the other hand, his father alone, who had taken a different courſe, condemning their errors, and worſhipping all his life no other than the one ſupreme God, as the guardian of his empire, had been remarkably ſucceſsful. By this means, he ſaid, that he had been led to give the preference to the God of his father, and to worſhip him only.

Theſe reflections led him to pray to the God of his father, deſiring that he would make himſelf known to him, and afford him aid in his preſent difficulties; and while he was praying, which was towards the ſetting

of

of the ſun, but in clear day-light, there appeared a luminous figure of a croſs, fixed upon the ſun, viſible not only to himſelf, but to all the ſoldiers who were with him, with this inſcription τῷτῳ νικα *By this conquer*. Being aſtoniſhed at this extraordinary appearance, and not knowing what to make of it, the night following Chriſt appeared to him in a dream, with the very ſame ſign which he had ſeen in the heavens, ordering him to make a military ſtandard like it, and aſſuring him that it would be his ſecurity in his battles.

Early in the morning he called his friends together, and informed them of the prodigy; and having aſſembled his jewellers, he deſcribed to them the form of the ſtandard, and ordered them to execute it in gold and precious ſtones, which they accordingly did. Euſebius ſays that he had ſeen it, and he gives a very particular deſcription of it. He ſays that the emperor always uſed it in battle, and that he had others made like it, and carried at the head of all his armies.

Being then determined to worſhip no other God beſides him who had appeared to him, he ſent for thoſe who were the beſt acquainted with the myſteries of his religion, to aſk

them what God it could be, and what was the ſign that he had ſeen. They told him that the God he had ſeen was the only begotten ſon of the one true God, and that the figure was the ſymbol of immortality, and the trophy of the victory which, while he was on earth, he had gained over death. At the ſame time they explained to him the cauſe of his coming, and the reaſon of his incarnation. He heard them with pleaſure; and comparing their diſcourſe with what he had ſeen, he was ſatisfied that it was by the interpoſition of God himſelf that he had been led to this knowledge. From this time he applied himſelf to the ſtudy of the ſcriptures, he made the prieſts of that God his aſſociates, and thought he ought to worſhip no other than the God whom he had ſeen. Therefore, confiding in him, he prepared to encounter the tyrant Maxentius *. On this extraordinary narrative I ſhall take the liberty to make a few obſervations.

1. It is in the higheſt degree improbable that the founder of ſo peaceable a religion as the chriſtian, who ſolemnly declared that his kingdom was *not of this world*, and who expreſſly forbade his ſervants to fight for him,

* Euſeb. Vita Conſtant. Lib. i. Cap. 28, &c. p. 515, &c.

ſhould

ſhould in this manner put himſelf at the head of an army, and like Mahomet, eſtabliſh his religion by the ſword.

2. It is little leſs improbable, that when chriſtianity had been ſo long preached in the world, and when the natural means of converſion were abundantly ſufficient, Chriſt ſhould interpoſe in perſon, as in the caſe of the Apoſtle Paul, to convert Conſtantine, or any other particular man.

3. If it be true, as Conſtantine here ſays, that his father had been all his life a worſhipper of the true God (by which he certainly meant the God of the chriſtians) it is very extraordinary that he ſhould not have brought up his ſon a chriſtian, or at leaſt have given him more knowledge of chriſtianity than he profeſſes to have had at the time of this appearance. Beſides, independently of any inſtructions he might have received from his father, or mother, it is not to be ſuppoſed that Conſtantine could have lived to the age of thirty (in the latter part of which the chriſtians had been ſo violently perſecuted, that they and their principles muſt have been the ſubjects of general converſation) and yet have known ſo little of chriſtianity as this ſtory ſuppoſes. According to it, he did not even know the mean-

ing of the ſign of the croſs, and had no aſſiſtance whatſoever except from his own reflections.

4. There is manifeſtly an inconſiſtency in the ſtory in this very reſpect, as it repreſents Conſtantine ſending for the prieſts of the God that he had ſeen in his viſion, which implies that he knew what God it was, and then aſking them who he was, and what was the meaning of the figure of the croſs, as if he had never ſeen it before. Had he really been in the circumſtances that he deſcribes, viz. wholly ignorant of this ſtrange God, and this ſymbol, he would naturally have made a proclamation to aſſemble the prieſts and miniſters of all religions, without diſtinction, and not thoſe of any one in particular.

5. It is ſomething extraordinary that the prieſts whom he did ſend for ſhould be ſuch biſhops, or preſbyters, as held the ſame opinions concerning Chriſt that Euſebius himſelf profeſſed, conſidering Chriſt as a *God*, who had become *incarnate*, and that the whole of the ſubſequent hiſtory, which repreſents Conſtantine as fighting and triumphing under the conduct of this incarnate God, ſhould give ſo much countenance to the doctrine of the Nicene creed.

6. We

6. We have no account of this appearance, any more than of the viſion, except from Conſtantine; though others are ſaid to have ſeen this figure in the heavens, as well as himſelf. We have therefore the evidence of not more than one perſon for this extraordinary fact, and that of an emperor, whom few would chuſe to contradict, ſo far as to ſay they were preſent, and ſaw no ſuch thing; ſo that the evidence, when properly examined, cannot be ſaid to be very ſtrong. Though, therefore, we may not be able to diſcover where the fallacy lies; whether the emperor really imagined that he ſaw ſuch a figure in the ſky, and had the dream in conſequence of it, or whether he and his chriſtian friends, ſeeing nothing more than a natural parhelion (which ſometimes does exhibit the appearance of a croſs) and then fancying they ſaw the inſcription alſo, purpoſely made the moſt of it, in order to encourage the ſoldiers (who, having ſerved under his father, were probably in a great meaſure chriſtians) the ſtory is far from being intitled to credit.

Upon the whole, it appears to me moſt probable, that Conſtantine and his friends ſaw a natural parhelion, and that all the other cir-

cumſtances were either imagined, or invented; and that the ſtory has loſt nothing in paſſing through the hands of Euſebius. I am unwilling to think that the whole was an abſolute invention of the emperor, though I ſhould be diſpoſed to admit *this* rather than the truth of two miracles, for which there is ſo little evidence, and that of the moſt ſuſpicious nature, and alſo which is attended with ſo many improbable, and inconſiſtent circumſtances, as I have pointed out.

That Conſtantine was prone to ſuperſtition, has been ſufficiently evident from the account of the laſt ſcenes of his life. I am therefore the more willing to ſuppoſe that he was always ſo much inclined to it, as involuntarily to magnify a natural appearance into a prodigy, which is far from being uncommon, than that he purpoſely invented the whole for any purpoſe of ambition. When he was emperor we do not find that he had recourſe to artifice to gain any point. On the contrary, he made too much uſe of power. Some addreſs he avows with reſpect to his project for compoſing differences among chriſtians. But this was chiefly good temper, forbearance, and complaiſance, and nothing that could be called

called impoſition, or deceit; and in this buſineſs alſo the engine that he made the moſt uſe of was power.

Mr. Gibbon, whoſe hatred of chriſtianity gives a tinge to his whole hiſtory (and this, like any other ſtrong and unreaſonable prejudice, has often miſled him, and made him aſcribe events to the moſt improbable cauſes) ſuppoſes that Conſtantine might be led to embrace chriſtianity by the diſpoſition to paſſive obedience in chriſtians.

"The paſſive and unreſiſting obedience," he ſays*, "which bows under the yoke of au-
"thority, and even of oppreſſion, muſt have
"appeared, in the eyes of an abſolute mo-
"narch, the moſt conſpicuous and uſeful of
"the evangelic virtues. The primitive chriſ-
"tians derived the inſtitution of civil govern-
"ment, not from the conſent of the people,
"but from the decrees of Heaven. The reign-
"ing emperor, though he had uſurped the
"ſceptre by treaſon and murder, immediately
"aſſumed the ſacred character of vicegerent
"of the deity. To the deity alone he was
"accountable for the abuſe of his power, and
"his ſubjects were indiſſolubly bound by their
"oath of fidelity to a tyrant who had violated

* Vol. ii. p. 187.

"every

" every law of nature or ſociety. The hum-
" ble chriſtians were ſent into the world as
" ſheep among wolves; and ſince they were
" not permitted to employ force, even in the
" defence of their religion, they would be
" ſtill more criminal if they ſhould be tempted
" to ſhed the blood of their fellow creatures
" in diſputing the vain privileges, or the for-
" did poſſeſſions of this tranſitory life."

This is only a ſpecimen of that malicious ſarcaſm, unworthy of every thing that bears the name of *hiſtory*, and highly unbecoming the dignity of it, with which this *impartial hiſtorian*, as he would be called, ever treats chriſtianity, and it prevented his ſeeing that, by putting himſelf at the head of a ſmall number of paſſive and unwarlike people, Conſtantine had but little chance of getting the better of the great majority, who were obſtinate and warlike. With the views that Mr. Gibbon aſcribes to Conſtantine, he would more naturally have thought, that if he could recommend himſelf to thoſe ſubjects of the empire who alone were formidable, he did not need to give himſelf any uneaſineſs about the reſt, ſince they were ready to ſubmit to any maſter whom God ſhould ſend them. How does this conduct of Conſtantine ſuit with that pro-

found

found policy which Mr. Gibbon elſewhere aſcribes to him, and how could he expect "to infuſe his own intrepid ſpirit," which he ſays* he did, into ſuch troops as theſe tame and ſpiritleſs chriſtians could furniſh him with?

Beſides, what would it have availed Conſtantine to have the favour of ſuch tame ſubjects as Mr. Gibbon repreſents the chriſtians to have been, who were as ready to attach themſelves to any other, even a profeſſed enemy of their religion, as to him. For, according to Mr. Gibbon, all ſovereigns, being equally ſent of God, would have been equally acceptable to them. In theſe circumſtances how can we admit with Mr. Gibbon†, that "the piercing eye of ambition and avarice "ſoon diſcovered to Conſtantine that the pro-"feſſion of chriſtianity might contribute to "the intereſt of the preſent, as well as of the "future life." This hiſtorian will hardly admit that at the acceſſion of Conſtantine, chriſtianity had ſo far eſtabliſhed itſelf, by its own evidence, as to have been embraced by a majority of the ſubjects of the Roman empire. For this, ſurely, would be to admit the truth of it; and unbelievers in general are

* Page 76. † Page 208.

willing to aſcribe its eſtabliſhment to the power of Conſtantine exerted in its favour; and the immediately preceding perſecution by Diocletian ſhewed that, with reſpect to power, and no doubt wealth alſo, the chriſtians were greatly inferior to the pagans. In theſe circumſtances Conſtantine's eye of ambition and avarice muſt have been a good deal clouded to ſee any proſpect of ſucceſs in his conteſt for the empire by the aid of chriſtianity. Or, if his eyes were clear, thoſe of Julian muſt have been very dull, to attempt the ſubverſion of chriſtianity, when the profeſſors of it were, no doubt, much more numerous than they were at the acceſſion of Conſtantine, and when it had had the advantage of a long eſtabliſhment in its favour.

With ſuch prejudices as Mr. Gibbon every where diſcovers, it was impoſſible for him to perceive the true ſpirit of chriſtianity, or the nature and value of the character which it forms. Elſe he would not have concluded, that becauſe men may magnanimouſly ſuffer for their religion, and would bear any torture rather than deny or diſguiſe their real belief (which Mr. Gibbon makes no ſcruple of doing, by outwardly profeſſing that religion which he at the ſame time cannot forbear treating

ing with contempt) they would tamely abandon their civil rights. Let him ſhew that, by becoming *a chriſtian*, a perſon gives up any of his rights *as a man*, or that he will have leſs public ſpirit, and act with leſs zeal in the defence of his own rights, and thoſe of others. Rather, as the chriſtian does not value life as ſuch, it may be concluded that he will be more ready to ſacrifice it in the cauſe of his country and of mankind. Mr. Gibbon will hardly ſay that the Jews were forbidden the uſe of arms, and chriſtians worſhip the ſame God that they did.

It cannot affect the evidence of chriſtianity to ſuppoſe that the foundation of civil government had never been at all conſidered by Chriſt or the apoſtles, and conſequently that they never had any opinion on the ſubject. They certainly do not ſay that a right to power is *not* derived from the conſent of the people. And finding themſelves under a government which it was not in their power to change, it was very natural, and right, in them to exhort their followers to ſubmit to it, as to the ſituation in which it had pleaſed divine providence to place them.

What Mr. Gibbon ſays of Conſtantine's converſion to chriſtianity being promoted by the

the murder of his ſon, is almoſt too contemptable to be mentioned, as it ſhews the moſt violent and malignant prejudice. "At the time "of the death of Criſpus," he ſays*, "the "emperor could no longer heſitate in the "choice of a religion. He could no longer "be ignorant that the church was poſſeſſed of "an infallible remedy, though he choſe to "defer the application of it till the approach "of death had removed the temptation and "danger of a relapſe". This is to inſinuate that chriſtianity encourages crimes by providing an expiation for them, and that a man is more diſpoſed to become a chriſtian in conſequence of having committed them, whether he have had any proper evidence of its truth or not.

If Conſtantine had no previous belief of a future ſtate, and of the puniſhments which chriſtianity denounces againſt all ſinners, what occaſion could he think he had of a pardon of ſin? Were Nero, Domitian, or Commodus the more inclined to chriſtianity in conſequence of the many murders they committed, or Maxentius, Galerius, and others who had imbrued their hands in the innocent blood of chriſtians in his own time? Will Mr. Gibbon

* Page 207.

himſelf,

himſelf, labouring under any mortal diſeaſe, take the preſcription of a quack, merely becauſe he promiſes him a cure.

This remark of Mr. Gibbon's agrees with what he ſays of one of his *ſecondary cauſes* of the ſpread of chriſtianity, viz. that it held out to mankind the happineſs of a future ſtate. But certainly there muſt be ſome other foundation of faith, beſides a mere *promiſe*. The heathen religion promiſed all temporal proſperity to the worſhippers of the Gods, and it is well known that the happineſs of this world has as powerful attractions with reſpect to the bulk of mankind as that of another. But thoſe promiſes did not ſecure the perpetuity of thoſe religions. In time men ſaw no ground of faith in them, and they deſerted them for a religion that held out to them nothing but ſufferings and death in this world, with well grounded hopes of recompence in another. As to Conſtantine, there can be no doubt but that he was as ſincere a chriſtian before the death of Criſpus, as he was after that event, and Mr. Gibbon only mentions the circumſtance for the ſake of the opportunity it gave him to throw out a ſneer againſt chriſtianity.

The

The *writers* that properly fall within this ſhort period are ſo few, that I ſhall reſerve an account of them to the concluſion of the next; and indeed from this time I ſhall not think it neceſſary to notice more than the principal of them in any period, and that in the ſhorteſt manner.

PERIOD

PERIOD VIII.

FROM THE DEATH OF CONSTANTINE A. D. 337, TO THAT OF CONSTANTIUS, A. D. 361.

SECTION I.

General Obſervations on the State of Things in this Reign.

CONSTANTINE had three ſons, and by his laſt will he divided his empire among them, in the following manner: To Conſtantine, the eldeſt, he gave Britain, Gaul, Spain, and the proconſular part of Africa. To Conſtantius, the ſecond ſon, he gave Egypt, and all the eaſtern part of the empire, with Thrace, and of courſe Conſtantinople; and to Conſtans, the youngeſt, he gave Italy, Greece, Macedonia, and Illyricum. He alſo left a brother of the name of Julius, and two nephews by another brother, and to theſe certain provinces had been aſſigned. But the ar-

my declared they would not obey any other than the ſons of Conſtantine, and put them to death; ſome ſay with the conſent of Conſtantius, or even in compliance with the private will of Conſtantine. But both theſe ſuppoſitions are deſtitute of proof. In this maſſacre two ſons of Julius, by different wives, were ſpared, viz. Gallus, and Julian, afterwards the famous emperor of that name, at this time only eight years old. They were both of them put under the care of Euſebius of Nicomedia, and were made readers in his church.

Sozomen gives a very favourable, and, upon the whole, I doubt not, a very juſt, idea of the ſtate of chriſtianity in the reign of Conſtantine's ſons. The biſhops in general, he ſays, were men of exemplary characters and conduct, and the people under their care were attentive to the diſcharge of their proper duties, ſo that chriſtianity gained ground every day, and by the zeal and virtues of the clergy, many Gentiles were brought over from their ſuperſtitions. To this good effect the emperors themſelves contributed not a little, having no leſs zeal for chriſtianity than their father. But, unhappily, they made the ſame uſe of their power that he had done before them, in doing that which ought to have been left to

reaſon and perſuaſion. This, however, is not obſerved by any hiſtorian of the time.

Theſe new emperors allowed the clergy, their children, and families, ſeveral privileges. They alſo made laws of their own, ſimilar to thoſe of their father, the object of which was to reſtrain the idolatry of the heathens. They ordered all the heathen temples to be ſhut up, both in the city and the country, and converted the materials of them into chriſtian churches. For, like their father, they diſtinguiſhed themſelves by repairing old churches, and building new and magnificent ones. Of this number was the church at Emeſa, which was famous for its beauty.

In the ſame ſpirit of zeal with that of their father, but which our more liberal ideas muſt condemn, they forbade Jews to purchaſe ſlaves from any ſect beſides their own, under the penalty of ſuch ſlaves becoming the property of the treaſury; and they made it confiſcation of goods, and even death, for a Jew to circumciſe any ſlave. The object of this law was, that all the heathens who changed their religion might become chriſtians. For at that time, our hiſtorian ſays, no converts were made to chriſtianity, except from them*

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. iii. Cap. 17. p. 122.

Indeed, we cannot wonder that a total ſtop ſhould be put to the converſion of the Jews, when chriſtians began to conſider Chriſt as a god, and thereby to infringe upon that doctrine which, from long before the time of our Saviour, and in every period ſince, they have juſtly held to be moſt ſacred, viz. *the Unity of God*. To eſtabliſh this doctrine, and to teach it to the whole world was the one great object of the Jewiſh religion, and of all the privileges of their nation. They therefore juſtly conſider all trinitarian chriſtians as idolaters, and with peculiar averſion, as being more inexcuſable than the heathens themſelves.

There cannot be a ſtronger argument againſt the interference of civil power in matters of religion than the hiſtory of Conſtantine and his ſons, the firſt of the princes of this world who took chriſtianity under their protection. Conſtantine was, by his own confeſſion, very imperfectly inſtructed in the principles of chriſtianity when he undertook this new and arduous office. He firſt got himſelf inſtructed by ſome particular biſhops, and preſently after patronizing the party of his inſtructors. He procured the condemnation of every ſect that was hoſtile to them, and enforced their deciſions which in effect he himſelf dictated,

by

by rigorous civil puniſhments. It was not long, however, before he ſaw reaſon to change his opinion, or at leaſt his conduct. Before he died he was entirely reconciled to Arius and his friends, to whom he had been moſt violently hoſtile; and he entered into their meaſures as readily, and as warmly, as he had done into thoſe of their enemies.

His eldeſt ſon Conſtantine, and his youngeſt Conſtans, retained the firſt opinions of their father with reſpect to the perſon of Chriſt; and in their dominions, viz. in the Weſt, the Trinitarian doctrine was ſupported. But Conſtantius embracing what was then called the Arian doctrine, ſuch Arianiſm was in his reign the orthodoxy of the Eaſt, and the majority of the biſhops were too ready then, as they have been ever ſince, to change with the court. Such a bias has intereſt on the minds of men, chriſtians, and chriſtian clergy, not excepted. But that the ſtandard of faith ſhould be fixed by the caprice (for all hiſtory ſhews that it deſerves no better name) of men who, in general, give but little attention to the ſubject of religion, and who, if they ſhould do it, are commonly the leaſt able to judge concerning it (in conſequence of their minds being occupied with other things, and eſpeci-

ally on account of the temptation they are under to make religion a mere engine of civil policy) is peculiarly reproachful to chriſtians and chriſtian clergy, who ought to call no man maſter upon earth, and much leſs thoſe who ought rather to be their diſciples.

It would not be half ſo prepoſterous in princes and ſtateſmen to eſtabliſh a ſyſtem of *medicine* within their dominions, and to oblige all their ſubjects to ſubmit to be treated as phyſicians of their appointment ſhould direct, as to eſtabliſh a ſyſtem of *theology*, and enforce a conformity to it by temporal rewards and puniſhments. It might even be ſaid, that the health of their ſubjects is an affair of a civil nature, in which the civil magiſtrate is deeply intereſted, and that therefore it becomes him to make ſuch proviſion for it as to his wiſdom ſhould ſeem beſt. But if, notwithſtanding this pretence, all men are allowed to provide for the health of their bodies in whatever manner they pleaſe, or to neglect it altogether if they think proper, much leſs pretence is there to preſcribe to men in what relates to the health of their minds, and their happineſs in a ſtate to which the power of civil magiſtrates does not extend, and where, without having any advantage over the meaneſt

eſt of their ſubjects, they themſelves muſt *receive according to their works*; and when the part they ſhall have acted towards their fellow chriſtians and fellow men, will not be overlooked.

In any other view than this above-mentioned, the eccleſiaſtical hiſtory of the reign of Conſtantius is as uninſtructive, as it is unpleaſant and tireſome; as it conſiſts of little beſides a ſtruggle between the Nicene and the Antinicene biſhops, or the Arian and Athanaſian parties, as they may be properly termed in this reign, in which Athanaſius himſelf, and his adventures, make ſo great a figure. Many were the councils which we ſhall be obliged to attend on both ſides*, but councils

The number of councils held in this reign is pleaſantly ridiculed by Ammianus Marcellinus, a heathen hiſtorian. Speaking of Conſtantius he ſays (in Mr. Gibbin's tranſlation, Vol. 2. p. 266) "The chriſtian religi-
"on, which in itſelf is plain and ſimple, he confounded
"by the dotage of ſuperſtition. Inſtead of reconciling
"the parties by the weight of his authority, he che-
"riſhed and propagated by verbal diſputes, the differ-
"ences which his vain curioſity had excited. The
"highways were covered with troops of biſhops gallop-
"ing from every ſide to the aſſemblies which they call
"*ſynods*; and while they laboured to reduce the whole
"ſect to their peculiar opinions, the public eſtabliſh-
"ment of the poſts was almoſt ruined by their haſty and
"repeated journies." I ſee nothing, however, in the original which implies that Conſtantius might have re-

in which nothing materially new was decided; ſo that at the cloſe of this reign the doctrine of the trinity ſtood very nearly as it had done before the council of Nice, ſince all who called themſelves orthodox, or catholic, maintained that Chriſt, or the logos, was the uncreated attribute of the Father, but inferior to him; only *God of God*, and *light of light*, not αὐτοθεὸς, or *God of himſelf*. A real advance, however, was made towards the cloſe of this reign, in the ſyſtem of Arianiſm.

SECTION II.

From the beginning of the Reign of Conſtantius A. D. 337, *to the Council of Sardica, A. D.* 347.

PRESENTLY after the death of Conſtantine, his ſon of the ſame name ſent Athanaſius from Treves, the place of his baniſh-

conciled the parties by the weight of his authority, or that the differences among the biſhops were excited by his vain curioſity. The imperial authority would have availed nothing in this caſe; nor were the differences of opinion at all excited by his curioſity, but by other cauſes.

ment,

ment, where he had had frequent interviews with him, to his ſee at Alexandria, Conſtantius under whoſe government Egypt was, making no oppoſition to it, though the meaſure gave great offence to Euſebius of Nicomedia, and all the Arians, who complained of it as an irregular proceeding, ſince he was not reinſtated in the ſame manner in which he had been depoſed, viz. by a council. It is ſaid, however, that he was received with great joy by the people of his dioceſe*. At the ſame time alſo, and by the ſame power, Marcellus of Ancyra, and Aſclepas of Gaza, were ſent to their reſpective ſees, though they did not obtain poſſeſſion of them till ſome time afterwards.

About this time died Euſebius the hiſtorian, biſhop of Cæſarea, and was ſucceeded by Acacius, who will make a conſiderable figure in the tranſactions of this reign; and not long after, viz. A. D. 340, Conſtantine, invading the territories of his brother Conſtans, was killed in battle near Aquileia, in the third year of his reign. Being the eldeſt of his father's ſons, he thought his diviſion of the empire too ſmall, and had claimed all Africa and Italy.

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. ii. Cap. 3. p. 81.

After

After the death of Alexander biſhop of Conſtantinople, which was at the age of ninety-eight years, Paul was choſen in his place, to the great diſpleaſure of the Arians, who would have raiſed Macedonius to that dignity. This, however, being done in the abſence of Conſtantius, he cauſed him to be removed, and put Euſebius of Nicomedia in his place*.

This proceeding being contrary to the canons, a council was held immediately after at Alexandria, by the friends of Athanaſius and Alexander, conſiſting of about an hundred biſhops of Egypt, Thebais, Lybia, and Pentapolis, who took advantage of it to criminate Euſebius, as the perſecutor of Athanaſius, whom they, in their letters to the biſhops, juſtify from all the accuſations which had been brought againſt him †.

Theſe proceedings, in Egypt, where Athanaſius had no doubt many friends, did not deter Euſebius and his party from engaging in other meaſures againſt him, in a council held at Antioch, five years after the death of Conſtantine, A. D. 341, in which Flaccillus biſhop of that city preſided. But neither Maximus biſhop of Jeruſalem, nor Julius biſhop of

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. ii. Cap. 6, 7. p. 83, 84.
† Athanaſii Apologia II. Opera. Vol. i. p. 720.

Rome

Rome was there, though Socrates ſays that the eccleſiaſtical canons forbade any thing to be done in the church without the conſent of the biſhop of Rome. However, he could only mean that it had not been reckoned decent to determine any thing of conſequence without the concurrence of ſo eminent a biſhop as that of Rome, any more than without the concurrence of the biſhop of Antioch, of Conſtantinople, or of Alexandria. For there was no decree of any council in favour of the biſhop of Rome in particular.

This council was dignified by the preſence of Conſtantius himſelf, who, wiſhing to attend the dedication of a new church in Antioch, which in the life time of his father he had ſuperintended, thought it a convenient opportunity of calling this council*. Accordingly ninety-ſeven biſhops were aſſembled, and in it the friends of Euſebius accuſed Athanaſius of reſuming his ſee without the decree of any council, of exciting a ſedition upon his return, in which many perſons had died, and of beating ſome with his own hands, &c. They moreover brought up again what they had before laid to his charge in the council of Tyre†.

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. iii. Cap. 5. p. 97.

† Socratis Hiſt. Lib. ii. Cap. 8. p. 84.

Having

Having agreed on the depoſition of Athanaſius, the biſhops at Antioch appointed Gregory to ſucceed him, after the ſee had been refuſed by Euſebius of Emeſa *, on account of the affection which he knew the church of Alexandria bore to Athanaſius.

Indeed, nothing could be more unjuſt, or more contrary to ancient uſage, than thus obtruding upon a dioceſe a biſhop who was not of their own chuſing. But when it came to be a matter of importance to the ſtate who ſhould be poſſeſſed of any eccleſiaſtical dignity, the civil powers, on ſome pretence or other, claimed the nomination, and theſe biſhops acted, no doubt, by the direction of the emperor, who was in this caſe guided by them. Indeed, arbitrary princes are generally the tools of others, who are abler than themſelves, and who have got the aſcendancy over them.

* The hiſtory of this Euſebius is pretty remarkable, and is thus given by Socrates, from an account of George biſhop of Laodicea, who wrote his life. He was a native of Edeſſa, and was very early inſtructed in the knowledge of the ſcriptures, but he afterwards ſtudied them more accurately under Euſebius of Ceſarea and Patrophilus of Scythopolis. Coming to Antioch about the time that Euſtathius was depoſed (on the accuſation of Cyrus of Berea for holding the doctrine of Sabellius) he continued to live with Euphronius who ſucceeded him. It being then propoſed to advance him to the rank of preſbyter, he avoided it by going to Alexandria,

In this council it was agreed that no biſhop depoſed by any council ſhould be reſtored except by another council, conſiſting of at leaſt an equal number of biſhops. Even the catholic biſhops afterwards pleaded the authority of this council in their proceedings againſt Chryſoſtom, as we ſhall ſee in its proper place.

After diſpatching the affair of Athanaſius, the biſhops who were aſſembled at Antioch proceeded to fix a creed, which they prefaced by ſaying that they did not receive it from Arius, but from their anceſtors. In this creed it is declared, that there is *one God, and one only begotten ſon of God, who exiſted before all ages, and remained with the Father who begat him*, and that *by him all things viſible and inviſible were made*. By theſe few articles, they probably hoped to heal, or compromiſe, all their dif-

dria, where he ſtudied philoſophy; and it was after his return from that city to Antioch, that, becoming intimate with Flaccillus who ſucceeded Euphronius, he had this appointment to the ſee of Alexandria. Not chuſing to go thither, he went to Emeſa, but being inſulted at his ordination, as a perſon who was addicted to the Mathematics, by which was meant magic, he fled to George biſhop of Laodicea, who afterwards wrote his life. By his means, and the efforts of Flaccillus and Narciſſus, he was at length ſettled at Emeſa. Notwithſtanding he ſubſcribed to the decree at Antioch, he was accuſed of Sabellianiſm; but Conſtantius, having an eſteem for him, took him with him when he went againſt the Barbarians, Lib. ii. Cap. 9. p. 86.

ferences

ferences, as it is expreſſed in ſuch a manner as that neither the friends of Arius, nor the advocates for the Nicene creed, could object to it.

But, apprehenſive perhaps that this would not be thought to come ſufficiently near to the Nicene creed, the members of this council agreed upon another, which was ſaid to have been the compoſition of Lucian of Antioch, who ſuffered martyrdom at Nicomedia, a circumſtance which, it might be thought, would recommend it to general acceptance*. In this creed Chriſt is ſaid to be *God of God, perfect out of perfect, the living word, wiſdom, life, the true light, not liable to change, the expreſs image of his Fathers divinity, ſubſtance, power, &c. the firſt born of every creature, who was in the beginning with God.* This comes much nearer to the Nicene creed, and is apparently more remote from Arianiſm, but ſtill conſiſtent with it, ſince the phraſe (ἐκ θεοῦ) *of God*, may not neceſſarily mean *from his ſubſtance*. Perhaps to appear farther removed from Arianiſm, the biſhops who compoſed this council pronounced an anathema againſt thoſe who ſaid that *the Son of God is a creature, like one of the creatures.* But the original Arians always made a great difference between Chriſt, the being by whom

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. iii. Cap. 5. p. 98.

all

all other things were made, and the *creatures* which were made by him; he being made by God himſelf, and other things not by God immediately, but by him.

Gregory above mentioned, being preſent, ſubſcribed this creed as biſhop of Alexandria*, and after the ſynod he was conducted by a guard of five thouſand ſoldiers, who were joined by the Arians of the city; but in the tumult one of the churches was ſet on fire and burned down. On this arrival of Gregory, Athanaſius made his eſcape, undiſcovered, and fled to Rome. But Euſebius and his friends, confiding in the goodneſs of their cauſe, wrote to Julius, the biſhop of Rome, requeſting that he would himſelf hear and decide the affair of Athanaſius†. In the mean time the Arians at Alexandria, not being ſatisfied with Gregory, in part on account of the burning of the church, and alſo becauſe they did not think him ſufficiently zealous in their intereſt, made choice of George of Cappadocia, one of the moſt diſtinguiſhed Arians of that age, whoſe untimely end I ſhall have occaſion to ſpeak of under the reign of Julian‡.

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. ii. Cap. 10. p. 86.
† Ibid. Lib. ii. Cap. 11. p. 89.
‡ Ibid. Lib. ii. Cap. 14. p. 92.

Euſebius

Euſebius did not live to ſee the iſſue of this affair of Athanaſius. He died preſently after this council of Antioch, and in his place the people choſe Paul a ſecond time; but the Arian party ordained Macedonius in another church of the city. Conſtantius, who was then at Antioch, hearing of this, ſent Hermogenes with a military force to expel Paul. But in this he was ſo violently oppoſed by the people, that in a tumult they burned his houſe, and killed him, by dragging him through the ſtreets by his feet. This happened A. D. 342.

On this the emperor himſelf went to Conſtantinople, expelled Paul, and puniſhed the citizens by leſſening their allowance of corn. He did not, however, think proper at that time to confirm the election of Macedonius, but ſuffered him to officiate in the church in which he had been ordained. Upon the death of Euſebius, who had been at the head of what was called the Arian party, the moſt active ſupporters of it were Theognis of Nice, Maris of Calcedon, Theodorus of Heraclea in Thrace, Urſacius of Singidunum in Upper Mœſia and Valens of Murcia in Upper Pannonia.

At

At this time the church and court of Rome were the refuge of all the biſhops who had ſuffered by the Arians, and indeed of thoſe who thought themſelves injured in any other reſpect. Not only had Athanaſius fled thither, but alſo Paul of Conſtantinople, Aſclepas of Gaza, Marcellus of Ancyra, and Lucius of Adrianople. All theſe Julius ſent back to their proper ſees, with letters of acquittal and recommendation, from a ſynod which he had called upon the occaſion. But the Eaſtern biſhops were much offended at this interference of Julius, and in a ſynod aſſembled at Antioch, A.D. 345, they wrote to reprove him for meddling in their affairs; alleging that they had not interfered when Novatus was condemned at Rome. And neither Marcellus nor Aſclepas was actually reſtored till after the council of Sardica; nor was Athanaſius reeſtabliſhed till five or ſix years after this time, though it might ſeem from Socrates* that he was then reſtored, though with much tumult and bloodſhed. But in this he refers to another reſtoration.

Conſtantius was no more pleaſed with the interference of the biſhop of Rome and his ſynod in the affairs of the Eaſt, than were the

* Lib. ii. Cap. 15. p. 92.

biſhops who met at Antioch; and hearing that Paul had recovered the ſee of Conſtantinople by that means, he ſent Philip the Præfect of the Prætorium, with orders to depoſe him, and to give the ſee to Macedonius, which till this time he had forborne to do. Accordingly, Philip, fearing a tumult, contrived to get Paul into his power by ſtratagem, and then ſent him to the place of his nativity at Theſſalonica. Still, however, the buſineſs was but half done, and ſo great was the oppoſition of the people, or, at leaſt, ſo great was the crowd that was aſſembled upon the occaſion, and which either would not, or could not, diſperſe, that the ſoldiers fell upon them, and more than three thouſand were killed, either by them, or by their treading upon one another.

About this time, according to Socrates, Conſtantius dedicated the celebrated church of St. Sophia in Conſtantinople, the architecture of which is admired to this day* Phi-

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. ii. Cap. 16. p. 94.
Cadrenus ſays that this edifice having fallen down, was rebuilt, and dedicated a ſecond time by Conſtantius. Valeſius's note. But it is perhaps more probable that Socrates is miſtaken in placing the *dedication* of this church at this time, if indeed he meant ſo much, for he only ſays that he then *built* it (ἐκτίζει)

Ioſtorgius ſays that when Conſtantius built this church, he removed into it the relics of the apoſtle Andrew, and thoſe of Luke the evangeliſt, from Achaia, and alſo thoſe of Timothy from Epheſus*. From this time this ſpecies of ſuperſtition was ſo common, that particular inſtances of it will not deſerve to be mentioned. In a later period, no church, or altar, was thought to be duly conſecrated, unleſs it contained ſome relics.

The emperor Conſtans, finding that the council which Julius had called at Rome had produced no effect, and that neither Athanaſius nor Paul were reinſtated in their ſees, owing to the oppoſition of his brother, requeſted that three biſhops might be ſent to him, to confer upon the ſubject. Accordingly Narciſſus of Cilicia, Theognis of Nice, Maris of Chalcedon, and alſo Mark of Syria, were diſpatched from the Eaſt for that purpoſe. But refuſing to confer with Athanaſius, and preſenting a confeſſion of faith different (though in no material reſpect) from that which had been drawn up at Antioch, they were diſmiſſed without effecting any thing.

At this time we find the firſt mention of Photinus as biſhop of Sirmium. He had been

* Lib. iii. Cap. 2. p. 486.

the diſciple of Marcellus of Ancyra, and from him the Unitarians were for a long time called *Photinians**.

My reader will imagine that we have already had creeds enow in the life of one emperor; but they are not one half of thoſe that were the produce of this reign. In the year 344 or 345, there was another council at Antioch, conſiſting of almoſt all the biſhops of the Eaſt, on what occaſion convened does not appear; but in it they drew up another creed, longer than any of the preceding, and ſent it to the biſhops in the Weſt. It is by no means Arian, and differs in nothing from the Nicene creed, except in its not containing the word *conſubſtantial*. It not only ſpeaks of Chriſt as *God of God* and *light of light*, but anathematizes thoſe who ſay that *the Son was produced from any other ſubſtance than God*, or that *there was any time in which he did not exiſt;* and that it cannot be ſaid without danger of error, that the Son was *made out of nothing*; ſince this is not ſaid of him in the ſcriptures; but it condemns thoſe who ſay that the Father did not beget the Son *of his own will and pleaſure*. At the ſame time the biſhops of this council execrate and anathematize thoſe who ſay " that

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. ii. Cap. 18. p. 97.

" Chriſt

"Chriſt is *a mere man*, like Paul of Samoſata, "and the followers of Marcellus and Photi-"nus, who deny the eternal eſſence and divi-"nity of Chriſt, and his perpetual and im-"mortal kingdom, in order to eſtabliſh a "monarchy." They alſo condemn the Sabellians and Patripaſſians by name.

If we conſider the tenor of this creed, and the ſolemn declaration with which it concludes*, it will appear to be drawn up by the biſhops of the Eaſt, in order to give all poſſible ſatisfaction to their brethren in the Weſt, and to heal all the paſt breaches in the church; and the ſeeming tautology of it probably aroſe from their deſire to prevent all cavilling, as if it had not expreſſed their real ſentiments. It alſo furniſhes a proof that the generality of the Eaſtern biſhops did not entirely adopt the doctrine of Arius, though they diſapproved of the meaſures of his adverſaries, and could not reliſh the term *conſubſtantial*, as both unſcriptural, and expreſſly reprobated by the council which condemned Paul of Samoſata.

Notwithſtanding the peaceable and friendly diſpoſition of theſe Eaſtern biſhops, thoſe in the Weſt were not diſpoſed to receive their overtures with equal good temper. They be-

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. ii. Cap. 19. p. 98.

ing assembled at Milan A. D. 346, refused to give any opinion about the creed, alleging its being drawn up in Greek, which they did not well understand, that the Nicene creed was sufficient, and that all subtile explanations ought to be avoided. And since neither Paul of Constantinople, nor Athanasius, had been able to recover their sees, notwithstanding the letters of the emperor Constans in their favour, they requested that another general council might be held, in which that affair should be finally decided, and another formulary of faith drawn up, which should be agreed upon by all; alleging that the deposition of those bishops had no other cause than an attempt to unsettle the faith which had been fixed at Nice. Accordingly, both the emperors, wishing, no doubt, to compose all differences, agreed to call another council at Sardica in Illyricum, on the borders of both their dominions, for the eleventh year after the decease of Constantine, viz. A. D. 347 *.

* Socratis Hist. Lib. ii. Cap. 20. p. 103.

SEC.

SECTION III.

From the Council of Sardica, A. D. 347, to the Death of the Emperor Conſtans, A. D. 350.

WHEN the time that had been fixed was come, there were aſſembled at Sardica about three hundred of the Weſtern biſhops, but only ſeventy ſix of the Eaſtern, and among them Iſchyras biſhop of Mareotis, appointed by thoſe who had depoſed Athanaſius. Some of the Eaſtern biſhops alleged their bad health, and others the ſhortneſs of the time; for which they blamed Julius biſhop of Rome, though ſix months intervened between the calling and the holding of it. The true reaſon probably was, their being well appriſed that the Weſtern biſhops came with a determination to reverſe all their proceedings at Antioch, and that they would hear no reaſon to the contrary; which ſoon appeared to be the caſe. For when they were all aſſembled, the Weſtern biſhops inſiſted upon Paul and Athanaſius (and no doubt the other biſhops alſo whoſe

cauſes were to be decided) having a ſeat in the council. But to this the Eaſtern biſhops objected, that this would be to make them judges in their own cauſes, and that they would be obliged to acknowledge that they had done wrong in depoſing them, without having an opportunity of hearing any reaſon for changing their opinion.

Theſe objections not being admitted by Hoſius of Corduba, and Protogenes of Sardica, who of courſe preſided, the Eaſtern biſhops, after much fruitleſs negociation, left them, and formed a ſeparate council at Philippopolis in Thrace. There they confirmed their former decrees againſt Athanaſius, Paul, Marcellus, and Aſclepas. They alſo pronounced ſentence of depoſition againſt Julius biſhop of Rome, and Hoſius of Corduba, for communicating with them; and againſt Maximinus, biſhop of Treves, not only for communicating with Paul, but for refuſing to do it with ſome biſhops of the Eaſt. They alſo depoſed Protogenes biſhop of Sardica, and Gaudentius; the former for acquitting Marcellus whom they had condemned, and the latter for having oppoſed Cyriacus his predeceſſor, and for having favoured thoſe who had been depoſed by them. Having made

theſe decrees, they, according to cuſtom, wrote to the diſtant churches, warning them not to receive into their communion thoſe whom they had depoſed, or to communicate with them by letters.

They then drew up a creed, in which Socrates ſays they reprobated the word *conſubſtantial*. Sozomen, however, ſays that they only made no mention of it, but anathematized thoſe who ſaid there were *three gods*, that Chriſt was not God, or the ſame with the Father, Son, and Spirit, that the Son was unbegotten, or that there was a time when he was not.

This creed is in fact a condemnation of the Unitarians, and a confirmation of what they had agreed upon at Antioch; which, as I have obſerved, was of a conciliatory nature. By condemning thoſe who held that there are *three gods*, it is poſſible that they alluded to the doctrine of the perfect *equality* of the Son to the Father, which was contended for, and acquired the ſeal of orthodoxy, in a later period, but had probably been only juſt advanced, and had given offence, at this time. Socrates alſo ſays (according to the preſent copies) that theſe Eaſtern biſhops confirmed the uſe of the term ανομοιος, *i. e.* aſſerted that the Son

was

was *unlike* the Father; but from their ſubſequent conduct, it is probable that they did the very reverſe of this, agreeing with what was done by the Weſtern biſhops at Sardica*.

The Weſtern biſhops, aſſembling without the Eaſtern, firſt condemned them for their deſertion of the council, and then pronounced ſentence of depoſition againſt thoſe who had depoſed Athanaſius, viz. Theognis of Nice, Narciſſus of Irenopolis, Acacius of Cæſarea in Paleſtine, Menophantus of Epheſus, Urſacius of Singidunum, Valens of Murcia, and George of Laodicea†.

Having diſpatched this buſineſs, the biſhops aſſembled upon this occaſion confirmed the Nicene creed, with an expreſs approbation of the phraſe (ομοουσιον) *of the ſame ſubſtance*, and an expreſs condemnation of the phraſe (ομοιουσιον) *of like ſubſtance*, which then began to be contended for by the Arianizing, or more moderate party, and they ſent letters to the abſent biſhops containing copies of their reſolutions, and appealing to them to judge between them and the Eaſtern biſhops. At this council

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. ii. Cap. 20. p. 104. Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. iii. Cap. 11. p. 107.

† Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. iii. Cap. 12. p. 108.

Marcellus

Marcellus of Ancyra was reſtored to his ſee, on pleading that his book had been miſunderſtood, and that he did not hold the opinions of Paul of Samoſata*.

Thus ended the council of Sardica, from which ſo much had been expected. Inſtead of uniting the Eaſtern and Weſtern biſhops, it occaſioned a greater ſeparation between them, the former being probably offended that the latter did not receive their creed, or ſhew ſo good a diſpoſition towards a reconciliation as themſelves had diſcovered. Conſtans, however, was ſo much intent upon the reſtoration of Paul and Athanaſius, whoſe ſees were within the dominion of his brother (who had oppoſed their reſtoration before, and who was not likely to conſent to it now) that he abſolutely threatened him with war in caſe of his con-compliance †.

Upon this Conſtantius conſulted with his biſhops, and they adviſed him, for the ſake of peace, to comply with his brother's demands. Accordingly, he not only conſented, but wrote himſelf to Athanaſius, encouraging him to come to him, and aſſuring him of his readineſs to give him the poſſeſſion of his ſee.

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. ii. Cap. 20. p. 103.

† Ibid. Cap. 23. p. 108.

The

The biſhop appearing to diſtruſt him, the emperor wrote two other letters. After this, carrying with him a letter from Julius, written in the higheſt ſtile of encomium, to recommend him to the people of Alexandria, he waited upon Conſtantius, who received him very graciouſly, but would have ſtipulated with him for a church within his dioceſe for the uſe of the Arians. To this Athanaſius ſeemed to make no objection, provided that a ſimilar demand of his brother might be granted, viz. that, in every place in which the Arians were eſtabliſhed, there ſhould be a ſeparate place of aſſembly for thoſe of his perſuaſion. But the Arians being conſulted, ſaid that it would be inconvenient. Conſtantius then made no farther oppoſition; and not only conſented to the reſtoration of Athanaſius, but wrote letters to the people in his favour. At the ſame time he reſtored Paul of Conſtantinople, Marcellus of Ancyra, Aſclepas of Gaza, and Lucius of Adrianople, agreeably to the decrees of the council of Sardica*.

It might have been expected that, after ſo much condeſcenſion on the part of the emperor, in whoſe territories he was to reſide,

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. ii. Cap. 23. p. 209.

Athanaſius

Athanaſius would have proceeded immediately to Alexandria, and have taken quiet poſſeſſion of his ſee. But inſtead of this, he went to Jeruſalem, where he perſuaded Maximus the biſhop to call a council of the biſhops of Syria and Paleſtine, in which he was again reſtored to his ſee, and received into the communion of the church. From this council letters were ſent to Alexandria, and to all the biſhops of Syria and Egypt, to acquaint them with the reſolutions of it. This proceeding of Maximus expoſed him to the ridicule of the Arians, as he was one of thoſe who had conſented to the expulſion of Athanaſius in the former council.

After this Athanaſius purſued his journey to Alexandria, admoniſhing the people in all the cities through which he paſſed to avoid the Arians, and to receive into their communion none but thoſe who would admit the term *conſubſtantial*. This conduct gave his adverſaries a freſh handle againſt him, and eſpecially his attempting to make ordinations in other dioceſes *. Thus, however, at length was Athanaſius reinſtated in his ſee, A. D. 349. It was immediately after this, as Le Sueur ſuppoſes, that he called the council of

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. ii. Cap. 24. p. 116.

one

one hundred biſhops of Egypt, Thebais, Lybia, and Pentapolis, in which his innocence was again confirmed, and from which letters were addreſſed to all the Eaſtern churches, as was mentioned before.

Urſacius and Valens, ſeeing Athanaſius eſtabliſhed in his ſee, deſerted the party of the Arians, acknowledging their error to Julius biſhop of Rome, and ſubſcribing to the term *conſubſtantial*. They alſo wrote to Athanaſius, profeſſing their readineſs to hold communion with him for the future *.

The great ſupporter of the catholic cauſe, and of Athanaſius as at the head of it, was the emperor Conſtans; but he giving himſelf up to pleaſure, and ſuffering every abuſe of government, ſuch as ſelling the public em-

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. ii. Cap. 12, 13. p. 90. Cap. 24. p. 116.

Mr. Gibbon thinks the account of this recantation of Urſacius and Valens very improbable. "Their epiſtles "to Julius biſhop of Rome, and to Athanaſius himſelf," he ſays, "are ſo different from each other, that they "cannot both be genuine. The one ſpeaks the lan-"guage of criminals who confeſs their guilt and infamy, "the other of enemies who ſolicit on equal terms, an "honourable reconciliation." Hiſt. Vol. ii. p. 278. Note. Indeed, it cannot be ſuppoſed that theſe two biſhops ſhould have been ſo much reſpected by their party as they were after ſuch conduct as is aſcribed to them. They took the lead at the council of Ariminum, and in every thing relating to the Arians.

ployments,

ployments, &c. and pleaſing neither the people nor the army, one of his officers, Magnentius, was encouraged to revolt againſt him; when Conſtans, being unprepared for the conteſt, fled, and being purſued to a town near the Pyrennees, was put to death. The only thing for which he is praiſed by the orthodox, is the ſupport that he gave to their cauſe; and for this one virtue Athanaſius ſpeaks of him as a martyr*.

SECTION IV.

From the Death of Conſtans, A. D. 350, to that of Gallus, A. D. 354, including the Council of Sirmium againſt Photinus.

CONSTANTIUS being freed from the Perſian war, in which he had not been ſucceſsful, by an invaſion of Perſia by the Maſſagetæ, found himſelf at liberty to revenge the death of his brother; and this he did in a war of three years continuance, defeating Magnentius firſt in Pannonia, and then in Gaul, ſo that at length he was reduced to the

* Apol. I. Opera, Vol. i. p. 678.

neceſſity

neceſſity of putting an end to his own life, A. D. 353. We ſee in a ſtrong light, the power of the biſhops of the principal ſees at this time by Magnentius ſending ambaſſadors to Athanaſius biſhop of Alexandria, and by Conſtantius, his profeſſed enemy, thinking it worth his while to write to him, with profeſſions of friendſhip and regard on this occaſion*.

Valens biſhop of Murſa, is ſaid to have ingratiated himſelf with Conſtantius by his management at the battle of Murſa. For while the emperor was at hrs devotions in the church, during the engagement, the biſhop was aſſiduous in bringing him news of all the particulars of it, and gave him the firſt account of the enemy being put to flight. It is added to the account, but probably by the enemies of Valens and the Arians, that when he was aſked what authority he had for the news, he replied that an angel had brought him the intelligence†. But before this was accompliſhed, ſeveral events took place in the eccleſiaſtical world.

* Athanaſii ad vitam ſolitariam agentes epiſtola, Opera. Vol. i. p. 825. Ad Conſtantium Apologia, Vol. i. p. 677.

† Sulp. Severus, Lib. iii. Cap. 38. p. 266.

Being now ſole emperor, and under no reſtraint from the influence of a colleague, Conſtantius preſently took occaſion to reverſe what he had been in a manner compelled to do by his brother. He firſt baniſhed Paul from Conſtantinople; and, according to Socrates, he was put to death at Cucuſus in Armenia, by thoſe who were conducting him to Cappadocia, the place of his exile; but Sozomen ſays he could not tell whether he might not die of a diſeaſe. Marcellus was baniſhed from Ancyra, and his ſee reſtored to Baſil. Lucius biſhop of Adrianople was put into priſon, and died there, and the emperor was ſo provoked by the paſt conduct, and alſo by ſome recent accuſations of Athanaſius, eſpecially on account of his preſuming to ordain in other churches than his own, that he ordered him to be put to death wherever he ſhould be found. But this prelate, well knowing the predicament in which he ſtood, made his eſcape in time*.

According to the account of Athanaſius, the violences committed in Egypt, and eſpecially at Alexandria, by George of Cappadocia, who was appointed to ſucceed him, and by the armed force with which he was attended,

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. ii. Cap. 26. p. 119. Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. iv. Cap. 2. p. 132.

were never exceeded on any occaſion; but they were worthy, he ſays, of the Arians. The bodies of the dead were not even ſuffered to be buried, till the murderers themſelves concealed them in order to hide their own ſhame. But how could their ſhame have been concealed, when it muſt have been notorious, not only that the murders had been committed, but that the bodies had for ſome time lain expoſed. No names however are mentioned, except thoſe of fifteen biſhops and two preſbyters, who were baniſhed. He ſays there were more than thirty biſhops in all who were puniſhed in this manner.*

Athanaſius himſelf was in much perſonal danger. It being the preparation for the keeping of Eaſter, he and many of the congregation were employed in religious exerciſes in the church by the light of lamps, in the night, when Syrianus the commanding officer, accompanied with an armed force, broke open the doors, and fell upon them, though it does not appear that they made any reſiſtance. Some virgins were trampled to death as they endeavoured to make their eſcape, others the ſoldiers began to ſtrip for the purpoſe of violation, and ſeveral of the men were diſpatched with

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. iv. Cap. 29. p. 120.

arrows

arrows. The biſhop was on his throne, diſcharging the duties of his office, when being ſeized and hurried about, he narrowly eſcaped being torn in pieces, and for ſome time lay for dead*. How he eſcaped when his

* Mr. Gibbon gives the following account of this tranſaction, Vol. ii. p. 288. "On the memorable night, "when the church of St. Theonas was inveſted by the "troops of Syrianus, the archbiſhop, ſeated on his "throne, expected with calm and intrepid dignity the "approach of death. While the public devotion was "interrupted by ſhouts of rage, and cries of terror, he "animated the trembling congregation to expreſs their "religious confidence, by chaunting one of the pſalms "of David, which celebrates the triumph of the God of "Iſrael over the haughty and imperious tyrant of "Egypt." Then, deſcribing the ruſhing in of the ſoldiers into the church, he ſays "Athanaſius ſtill rejected "the pious importunities of the monks and preſbyters, "who were attached to his perſon, and nobly refuſed to "deſert his epiſcopal ſtation, till he had diſmiſſed in "ſafety the laſt of the congregation These minute "circumſtances," he adds in a Note, "are curious, as "they are literally tranſcribed from the proteſt which "was publicly preſented three days afterwards by the "catholics of Alexandria." I have, however, carefully peruſed this account, and find not one of the circumſtances mentioned in this Note. Some of them, however, are contained in Athanaſius's own account of his flight in his *Apology to the Emperor*, Opera Vol. i. p. 217. According to that the pſalm recited was one which celebrates the mercy of God as *enduring for ever*, in the margin called Pſalm 105th, or our 106th, and he only waited until the *greater part* of the congregation were diſperſed. Had he ſtaid till the *laſt*, as Mr. Gibbon repreſents him to have done, he could not poſſibly have eſcaped. Mr. Gibbon, probably made uſe of Fleury,

life was aimed at, the writers of the account (which was drawn up by order of the church) could not tell*. Getting by ſome means out of danger, he concealed himſelf ſix years in the deſerts of Thebais, till the death of Conſtantius. There, however, he was not idle, but continued to write and publiſh ſeveral books; and thence it is thought that he occaſionally made excurſions, even as far as Italy, without ever being diſcovered by his enemies.

Macedonius having ſucceeded Paul at Conſtantinople, greatly promoted a violent perſecution which the emperor now carried on againſt the Conſubſtantialiſts, firſt baniſhing all the biſhops who profeſſed that faith, and putting others in their places; and then compelling the people by confiſcation, exile, and, it is ſaid, even torture, to communicate with them. But the churches of Achaia, Illyricum, and Macedonia were not moleſted †. I would obſerve, however, that no inſtances are mentioned of this general and heinous accuſation.

who refers both to the account drawn up by the church, and to that by Athanaſius himſelf, and it is the latter, not quoted by Mr. Gibbon, that contains the particulars which he has embelliſhed.

* Athanaſii Opera, Vol. i. p. 866, &c.
† Socratis Hiſt. Lib. ii. Cap. 27. p. 120.

While theſe things were tranſacting in the Eaſt, Conſtantius was conducting the war againſt Magnentius in the Weſt. Being at Sirmium after the defeat of Vetranio (who had alſo declared himſelf emperor) A. D. 351, he convened a council for the purpoſe of depoſing Photinus, whom the decrees of two former councils had not been able to ſilence, on account of the great affection which his people had for him. To this council there came from the Eaſt George of Alexandria, and Baſil of Ancyra, and from the Weſt Hoſius of Corduba, but againſt his will. They ſoon agreed to depoſe Photinus, as holding the doctrine of Sabellius and of Paul of Samoſata. This, ſays our hiſtorian, was univerſally thought to be well done; but what they did afterwards had not the approbation of all*.

Having diſpatched the buſineſs of Photinus, the biſhops who were aſſembled on this occaſion ſat down, as was uſual in the councils of this reign, to compoſe a creed, and not contenting themſelves with one, they drew up two, one in Greek, compoſed by Mark of Arethuſa, and the other in Latin. In the Greek creed Chriſt is called *god of god, and light of light*, and it anathematized thoſe who taught that the Son

* Socratis Hiſt. Vol. i. Cap. 29. p. 123.

was *made out of nothing*, or *of any other ſubſtance than that of the Father*, or who ſay that *there ever was a time in which he did not exiſt*. This is ſufficiently agreeable to the doctrine of the Nicene creed.

With reſpect to Photinus, and the philoſophical unitarians, it equally condemns thoſe who ſay that the ſubſtance of God could be dilated or contracted, and that this dilated ſubſtance was the Son; and thoſe who aſſert that what was born of Mary was a mere man. At the ſame time they declare that the Son is not equal to the Father, but ſubject to him; and they anathematize thoſe who ſay that the Son was begotten without the Father's will. They add ſeveral propoſitions relating to the Holy Spirit, by which it appears that different opinions had begun to be advanced on that ſubject: but they are chiefly levelled againſt the philoſophical unitarians.

The Latin creed condemns the word *conſubſtantial* as unſcriptural, and an attempt to explain what is above the human capacity. In other reſpects it does not differ from the preceding, except in words, and in being much ſhorter, though, like the former, it contains much reaſoning.

From the tenor of theſe creeds, and all thoſe which have hitherto come before us in the courſe

courſe of this reign, it is highly probable that Euſebius of Nicomedia, and the other friends of Arius, did not intirely adopt his opinions (if indeed he himſelf adhered ſtrictly to what he firſt gave out) though they thought him right in ſome things, and were perſuaded that his enemies erred alſo, and eſpecially in carrying their animoſity againſt him much farther than the importance of the ſubject required. Since all theſe creeds inſiſt particularly on there being no time in which the Son was not, as well as on his being formed of no other ſubſtance than that of the Father, I think it probable that by this time there was ſuch a change in the ſentiments of thoſe who came to be deemed the orthodox party, as that they no longer ſuppoſed that the act which was called the *generation of the Son* took place a little before the creation, but in a proper ſenſe of the term, *from all eternity*.

Photinus being promiſed a reſtoration to his biſhopric provided he would ſubſcribe to theſe creeds, not only refuſed to do it, but challenged any of the biſhops who were preſent to diſpute with him publicly on the ſubject. Accordingly Baſil of Ancyra accepting his challenge, a time was fixed by the

emperor when himſelf and many perſons of ſenatorial rank, as well as the Fathers of the council, would be preſent, and notaries were provided to write what ſhould be advanced on both ſides. After a very eager debate, our hiſtorian ſays, that Photinus was vanquiſhed and condemned. It is evident, however, that Photinus himſelf was of a different opinion. For it is added that, in his baniſhment he wrote books both in the Latin and Greek languages, eſpecially againſt all hereſies, making no account of any opinions beſides his own *.

Notwithſtanding theſe Fathers had tendered the Latin creed, as well as the Greek one, to Photinus, on ſecond thoughts they were not themſelves pleaſed with it, thinking it not quite conſiſtent with itſelf; and they took pains to call in all the copies of it that were gone abroad, the emperor himſelf threatening to puniſh any perſon who ſhould conceal it, But it was already in too many hands for ſuch an order to have any effect †.

The venerable Hoſius, who, as I have obſerved, was preſent at this council, had ſome time before been baniſhed from his ſee by the Arian party, and was now brought by the

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. ii. Cap. 30. p. 124. Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. iv. Cap. 6. p. 135.

† Socratis Hiſt. ibid.

emperor

emperor to Sirmium againſt his will. As he refuſed at firſt to ſubſcribe the creed, our hiſtorian ſays he was compelled to do it by blows and torture*. But Sulpicius Severus ſays he was thought to be a favourer of the Arian party in Spain; but this was attributed to the weakneſs of age, as he was more then a hundred years old†. It is perhaps more probable that he rather favoured the unitarians.

Julius biſhop of Rome, the ſteady friend of Athanaſius dying about this time, was ſucceeded by Liberius, and as the Arians a little before the death of Julius had written to him, deſiring his communion, and a farther hearing of their charge againſt Athanaſius, Liberius thought it right to take it up, and therefore cited him to appear at Rome, and, on his refuſal, excommunicated him. After this he ſought the friendſhip of Athanaſius, and holding another ſynod, in which he examined the accuſations and defences of Athanaſius, he received him into his communion; but, not to irritate Conſtantius, he ſent a deputation, to intreat him to convoke a general council of the whole empire, to put an end to the differences of the church‡.

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. ii. Cap. 31. p. 130.
† Lib. ii. Cap. 40, p. 266.
‡ Hillarii fragmenta Opera, p. 450, 488.

Conſtan-

Conſtantius at firſt called a Synod at Arles, A.D. 353, where Saturninus the biſhop (called by Sulpicius Severus *, a violent and factious man) was a great promoter of the Arian cauſe, and being greatly irritated againſt Athanaſius, partly for the reaſons mentioned before, and partly becauſe he was ſaid to have taken the part of Magnentius, he procured him to be condemned again; but Paulinus of Treves, refuſing to concur with his brethren, was baniſhed to Phrygia †.

Gallus, whom Conſtantius had made Cæſar, and to whom he had given the command of the armies in the Eaſt while he went on the expedition againſt Magnentius in the Weſt, defeated the Jews who had revolted at Diocæſarea in Paleſtine, and totally deſtroyed the place. But being accuſed of endeavouring to make himſelf independent, Conſtantius ſent for him, and cauſed him to be put to death. The next year he made Julian his brother Cæſar, and ſent him to take the command in Gaul ‡.

* Lib. ii. Cap. 40. p. 266.
† Ibid. Lib. ii. Cap. 39. p. 261.
‡ Socratis Hiſt. Lib. ii. Cap. 33, 34. p. 131.

SEC-

SECTION V.

From the Death of Gallus A. D. 354 to the Council of Ariminum A. D. 359, including the riſe of the ANOMOEANS, *or thoſe who, after Aetius, maintained that the Son was of a Subſtance unlike that of the Father.*

ABOUT this time an advance was made in the doctrine of Arius. It was indeed a natural conſequence of what he had maintained, but was not actually drawn by him. He had ſaid that the ſon was made *out of nothing*, and that therefore he ought to be called a *creature*; but ſtill, as he was the maker of all other creatures, he thought him to be of a nature quite different from them, and ſimilar to that of the Divine Being, though not the ſame with it; and therefore his friends would gladly have ſubſtituted the term ομοιουσιος *of like ſubſtance* for ομοουσιος *of the ſame ſubſtance*. But though the proper conſequence of Arius's doctrine was, that ſince Chriſt was a mere creature, he could not differ materially from other creatures, and conſequently muſt be of a nature unlike that of the ſupreme and ſelf exiſtent Being; no perſon appears to have perceived, or at leaſt have

have had the courage to avow this conſequence before Aetius, who was followed by Eunomius, whoſe diſciples were often called Anomœans, from their maintaining that Chriſt was of a nature different from that of God (ανομοιος).

Aetius was a native of Antioch, originally, as ſome ſay, a phyſician, but certainly a man of excellent underſtanding, great acuteneſs, and well ſkilled in logic, as well as acquainted with other branches of ſcience. Becauſe he diſputed with ſubtilty concerning the nature of God, his enemies reproached him with the name of *Atheiſt*. He was much noticed by Gallus, who was fond of the ſociety of men of learning and religion, and Philoſtorgius ſays that he often ſent him to his brother Julian (though he muſt be miſtaken when he adds *in Gaul*) to recall him from heatheniſm, to which he was addicted.

Aetius's thirſt for knowledge led him to go to Alexandria, where he made himſelf maſter of the philoſophy of Ariſtotle. On his return to his native city he was ordained deacon by Leontius, who was then the biſhop. Here Aetius not only appeared to have adopted the opinions of Arius, but became an open and ſtrenuous defender of them;

them; and, thinking that Arius and his friends in general temporized, in order to pleaſe the emperor, he even ſeparated himſelf from their ſociety (though ſome ſay that he was excommunicated) avowing his opinion that Chriſt was not only not of the ſame nature with the Father, but of a different nature, and unlike to him. His zeal and ability were ſo great, that he ſoon made many diſciples at Antioch.

Eudoxius, who ſucceeded Leontius in that ſee, imbibed his doctrine, as well as Acacius of Cæſarea in Paleſtine, and Uranius of Tyre. George of Laodicea, in a letter written at the ſuggeſtion of ſome perſons whom Eudoxius had expelled, and addreſſed to a number of biſhops who were aſſembled at Ancyra at the dedication of a church which Baſil had built in that city, repreſents almoſt the whole city of Antioch as infected by the hereſy of Aetius.

Theſe biſhops, being alarmed, formed themſelves into a ſynod, in which they drew up a very long account of their faith, with much reaſoning on the ſubject, and in which they are very careful to diſtinguiſh between *the Son* and *a Creature*. This creed, as it may be called, is preſerved by Epiphanius *,

* Hær. 73. Opera. Vol. I. p. 846, &c.

together

together with a letter of Baſil of Ancyra and George of Laodicea, written to oppoſe the *new hereſy*, as they call it, of Aetius *. If what Philoſtorgius ſays be true, of Baſil having been deſirous of the ſee of Antioch before Eudoxius was placed in it, it will in ſome meaſure account for the oppoſition there was between theſe two prelates †.

Taking the affair into farther conſideration, they applied to the emperor to ſee that what had been decreed at Sardica and Sirmium (where it had been determined that the Son was *like* the Father) ſhould be carried into execution. The perſons ſent on this embaſſy were Baſil of Ancyra, Euſtathius of Sebaſtia, Eleuſius of Cyzicum, and Leontius, a preſbyter who had an office near the emperor's perſon. On their arrival they found Aſphalius a preſbyter of Antioch, a zealous friend of Aetius, who having procured letters from the emperor in his favour was about to return. But Conſtantius being informed of his hereſy, and that of Eudoxius, by theſe ambaſſadors, ſent an anſwer to the biſhops aſſembled at Ancyra, in which he

* Hær. 73. Opera. Vol. I. p. 859.
† Lib. iv. Cap. 6. p. 504.

assured them that he was far from being disposed to favour Eudoxius or Aetius, whom he considered as one whose study it was to deceive the ignorant multitude.

He desired them to recollect the discourse he had had with them, in which it was proved to their mutual satisfaction, that the Son, with respect to his substance, was *like* the Father. For the present, he says it may suffice to excommunicate them, but he threatens his farther vengeance if they did not refrain from their madness. He then proceeds in a strain of furious invective against the disciples of Aetius; and the historian ascribes it to the emperor's interference that their heresy did not prevail at this time*. Thus we see Constantius taking as decided a part in favour of the *Homoiousians* (for so the disciples of Aetius were called) as his Father had done in favour of the *Consubstantialists*, or the *Homoousians*, as they are sometimes termed.

Constantius having pacified the troubles of the empire, and being arrived at Milan, A.D. 355, which was thirty years after the council of Nice, in compliance with a very earnest request from the bishops summoned a general council to meet him there. Accord-

* Sozomeni Hist. Lib. iv. Cap. 13, 14. p. 146, &c.

ingly

ingly ſome few biſhops from the Eaſt, but more than three hundred from the Weſt, were aſſembled. But the Eaſtern biſhops inſiſting on the perpetual baniſhment of Athanaſius, and others as violently oppoſing it, the council broke up without effecting any thing*.

Upon this occaſion the emperor acted in a very arbitrary manner, baniſhing all the biſhops who would not comply with his will. At this time, however, Liberius, biſhop of Rome, ſhewed great firmneſs. For in a conference which he had with Conſtantius, he refuſed to conſent to the condemnation of Athanaſius, without a farther hearing of him before his accuſers. The emperor baniſhing him to Berea in Thrace; he, with a degree of ſpirit which approached to inſolence, refuſed a handſome allowance which was offered him for his maintenance; telling the officer that the emperor wanted all his money to pay his ſoldiers, &c †.

Hoſius, biſhop of Corduba, was another object of reſentment to the Arians, as well as Athanaſius, becauſe he prevented the biſhops of Spain from joining them againſt him. At their inſtigation the emperor ſent

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. ii. Cap. 36. p. 134.
† Theodoret. Lib. ii. Cap. 16. p. 92.

for

for him; and not being able, either by promiſes or threatenings, to make any impreſſion upon him, he kept him from his ſee till the council of Sirmium. The principal of the other biſhops who were baniſhed upon this occaſion, were Euſebius of Verceil, and Lucifer of Cagliari in Sardinia, both of whom were ſent to Thebais in Egypt, and Hilary of Poictiers who was ſent into Phrygia. Dionyſius, biſhop of Milan, would have conſented to the condemnation of Athanaſius, provided the articles of faith propoſed to them had given him ſatisfaction; but he, as well as the people of his ſee in general, rejecting a creed ſent from the emperor by Urſacius and Valens, he alſo was baniſhed, and Auxentius, an Arian, was put in his place*. During theſe tranſactions Athanaſius continued in the deſarts of Egypt, and thence he wrote an apology to Conſtantius, but without any effect.

After reſiding a long time at Milan, Conſtantius came to Rome, which he had never ſeen before, and with which he was greatly delighted; and there, with great pomp, but too much oſtentation, he celebrated the twentieth year of his reign. At this time the ſe-

* Sulp. Severus, Lib. ii. Cap. 39. p. 263.

nators, who had been applied to, declining the office, a number of reſpectable women petitioned the emperor for the return of Liberius; and he conſented, upon condition that he would enter into his views with reſpect to Athanaſius; and that Felix, who had been appointed to ſucceed him, might be continued to diſcharge the epiſcopal functions jointly with him. But becauſe Felix, though a conſubſtantialiſt himſelf, admitted thoſe of the other party to communion with him, the orthodox would not ſo much as enter the church while he was in it; and the populace being very clamorous on the occaſion, and frequently crying *one God, one Chriſt, one biſhop*, nothing was effected at that time.

Conſtantius, having remained a month at Rome, returned to Milan, and afterwards went to Sirmium, where the biſhops of his party being aſſembled, drew up another creed, ſuppoſed to have been the compoſition of Potamius, biſhop of Liſbon. In this it is expreſſly ſaid, that no mention ſhould be made of the term *conſubſtantial*, and the Father is declared to be without diſpute greater than the Son, who is however ſtiled *God of God*, and *Light of Light* *.

* Hilary de Synodis, p. 357.

Hoſius,

Hoſius, who was at this time an hundred years old, was compelled, and it is ſaid by torture, to ſubſcribe this creed; though Hilary ſays it was compoſed by him and Potamius together. Philoſtorgius ſays, that he ſubſcribed both the creed and the condemnation of Athanaſius; but Athanaſius himſelf ſays that he ſubſcribed the former, but not the latter. On his compliance, however, the emperor gave him his liberty; and returning to Spain, he died not long after, proteſting, it is ſaid, againſt the violence which had been offered to him.

Liberius, who had now been abſent from his ſee two years, wrote to the emperor by Fortunatian, to ſolicit his reſtoration. He likewiſe wrote to Vincent of Capua, to intercede for him; and in a letter to the Eaſtern biſhops, he acknowledged the juſtice of their proceedings againſt Athanaſius, and apologized for his own acquittal of him, which, he ſays, was only in conſequence of his having been received into communion by his predeceſſor Julius. The year following, having ſubſcribed the creed of Sirmium, and the condemnation of Athanaſius, he was permitted to return to Rome; where, notwithſtanding his abject conduct, and his having

ſubſcribed an heterodox creed, he was received with great joy; and Felix retiring of his own accord, he took quiet poſſeſſion of his ſee*.

SECTION VI.

Of the Councils of Ariminum and Seleucia, A. D. 359.

AS but few of the Eaſtern biſhops had attended theſe councils in the Weſt, and it was manifeſtly inconvenient for them ſo to do; and as, for the ſame reaſons, the Weſtern biſhops could not be expected to attend in the Eaſt, the emperor, in calling another general council, appointed the Weſtern biſhops to meet at Ariminum, and thoſe of the Eaſt at Nicomedia; intending to have it conſidered that all theſe biſhops, though meeting in different places, compoſed but one council. But in this ſcheme the emperor was again diſappointed. For the two aſſemblies did not agree, nor did thoſe who met at Ariminum agree among themſelves;

* Theodoret. Lib. ii. Cap. 17. p. 95.

and

and thoſe who met in the Eaſt differed ſtill more.

At Ariminum about four hundred biſhops were aſſembled, and Taurus, the præfect, had orders not to permit them to depart till they had agreed in a confeſſion of faith; the emperor promiſing him, as Sulpicius Severus adds, the conſulſhip in caſe he ſucceeded in this. Orders were given, on this as on other ſimilar occaſions, that all expences attending the travelling of the biſhops, ſhould be defrayed out of the public taxes; but the biſhops of Gaul and Britain generouſly refuſed this allowance, except three of the latter, who being poor could not afford it *.

The Athanaſians took poſſeſſion of the church, and the Arians, who did not amount to more than eighty, met in a ſeparate place. Among theſe Urſacius and Valens took the lead, and they propoſed to both parties that every thing which had paſſed with reſpect to articles of faith ſhould be deemed null, and another creed compoſed; and they produced one, in which Chriſt is ſaid to be *God of God*, and *like the Father who begat him*, but in which the term *conſubſtantial* was rejected.

* Sulp. Sever. Lib. ii. Cap. 41. p. 267.

When this creed had been read, a great majority who were not diſpoſed to favour the emperor ſaid, they did not come thither to fix a creed, becauſe none was wanted, but to repreſs any innovations that might have been made in any article of faith; and therefore, if there was nothing new in the creed which was preſented, they might proceed to the condemnation of the Arian doctrine, which had been the cauſe of ſo much miſchief in the world. On this the biſhops were divided, ſome receiving the new creed, and others adhering to the Nicene.

The advocates for the Nicene creed addreſſed a letter to the emperor, intreating him to permit that creed to continue to be the ſtandard of faith, without making any more innovations, and to allow them to return to their ſees. But Valens and Urſacius (who had been depoſed by the other party in this council, becauſe they would not join them in their condemnation of Arianiſm) arriving before the ambaſſadors from the council, prepoſſeſſed the mind of the emperor againſt them; ſo that without giving them a hearing, on the pretence of public buſineſs, he referred them for an audience to another time and place. To this meſſage the biſhops returned an anſwer, repeating

peating their requeſt of permiſſion to return home, ſince they could not recede from their determinations; and hearing nothing from the emperor in reply, Socrates ſays they diſmiſſed themſelves, and returned to their reſpective cities. But this appears not to have been the caſe, as they were detained by the præfect Taurus.

At this endeavour, at leaſt, to diſmiſs themſelves, the emperor was greatly exaſperated, as if theſe biſhops had acted in contempt of him. He therefore ordered the creed which had been preſented by Urſacius and Valens, to be tendered to all the biſhops of Italy, before they left Ariminum. The greater part being intimidated, complied, and thoſe who would not ſubſcribe it, were baniſhed, which occaſioned great diſturbances*.

Twenty of the party ſtill made a reſolute oppoſition, eſpecially Phæbadius of Agen in Aquitain and Servatio of Tongres; but at length they were prevailed upon by the intreaties of Taurus, and the addreſs of Valens and Urſacius, to ſign the creed propoſed to them. Theſe urged that all that they could object to in the creed was that it was defective, not that it was untrue; and that defect they might

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. ii. Cap. 37. p. 135.

themſelves ſupply, but that it was very deſirable that the whole church ſhould adopt the ſame formulary; and by this time, the biſhops in the Eaſt, as well as all but themſelves in the Weſt, had conſented to admit that the Son was *like the Father*, and that he was *not ſuch as the other creatures*. In this, Sulpicius ſays, they were deceived; as they ſigned what implied, though it did not expreſs, that the Son was *a creature**. Thus, as Jerom emphatically ſays, "all the world ſighed, and wonder-" ed to find itſelf Arian †."

It appears, Fleury obſerves, that the biſhops of this council attempted to get the lands belonging to churches exempted from all public taxes, but that the emperor refuſed his conſent. Afterwards, being at Antioch, A. D. 361, he exempted the clergy from all extraordinary taxes ‡.

The party of Urſacius and Valens having left Italy, aſſembled at Nice in Thrace, and there formed a council, in which the creed which had been preſented at Ariminum was ratified, with a view, as their adverſaries gave out, that this ſhould paſs for the anci-

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. ii. Cap. 44. p. 276.

† Dialogus, Adv. Luciferianos, Opera, Vol. i. p. 427.

‡ Lib. 14. Cap. 12. Vol. iii. p. 512.

ent

ent Nicene creed. But the fraud would have been ſo palpable that it cannot be ſuppoſed that any ſet of men would have attempted it.

While theſe things were tranſacting in the Weſt, the Arians in the Eaſt, having the favour and power of the emperor, expelled from their ſees all the biſhops who were not of their party; and in this Macedonius of Conſtantinople was the moſt active. The perſecution alſo extended to the Novatians, becauſe with reſpect to the doctrine of the Trinity they were orthodox, and the chief of their biſhops, Agelius, had recourſe to flight. It is ſaid that even torture was applied to compel perſons to join the Arians; and a variety of horrid and improbable barbarities are mentioned by Socrates, on the teſtimony of one Auxanon, a very old man, and a preſbyter among the Novatians, as having been committed on this occaſion. In Paphlagonia the Novatians withſtood the ſoldiers who were ſent to inforce the perſecuting orders, and after loſing many of their own number, killed them all. This Socrates ſays he had from a perſon who was preſent in the battle.

This violence of Macedonius gave great offence to thoſe of his own party, and to the emperor himſelf, who was alſo much diſpleaſed with

with him, becauſe, without his leave, he had removed the body of Conſtantine from the church in which it had been depoſited, into another, on pretence that the building in which it had been put was become ruinous, ſo that there was great danger of its falling, and maiming thoſe who might be paſſing near it. Others, however, and eſpecially the orthodox, had made ſo much oppoſition to the removal of the body, that, the two parties coming to blows in the church itſelf, much ſlaughter was made on both ſides*.

When the weſtern council was called at Ariminum, the Eaſtern biſhops had been ſummoned to meet at Nicomedia; but they were obliged to leave that place preſently after they had begun to aſſemble, on account of an earthquake, in which the church where the council was to have been celebrated, Philoſtorgius ſays, was overthrown, and Cecropius biſhop of the city, and fifteen other biſhops who were alſo in it, were buried in the ruins†.

Being driven from this place, the biſhops aſſembled at Seleucia in Iſauria, to the number of one hundred and fifty. But the iſſue of this council was not more favourable than

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. ii. Cap. 38. p. 145.
† Lib. iv. Cap. 10. p. 506.

that of the West. For some, as Macedonius and others, fearing to have their conduct enquired into, did not attend, and those who did attend differed in opinion, some refusing to consider any article of faith till they had decided concerning those who had been accused, and others contending for the discussion of a creed in the first place. The emperor's own directions on the subject also were various. The bishops were therefore divided into two parties, at the head of one, consisting of thirty, was Acacius of Cæsarea in Palestine, George of Alexandria, Uranius of Tyre, and Eudoxius of Antioch; and at the head of the rest, who were the majority, was George of Laodicea in Syria, Sophronius of Pompeiopolis in Paphlagonia, and Eleusius of Cyzicum.

Coming at length to consider the articles of faith, the party of Acacius was for abolishing the Nicene creed, and composing a new one; but the larger party were only for throwing out the term *consubstantial*. After some time, Sylvanus bishop of Tarsus cried out that they wanted no other creed besides that which had been agreed upon at Antioch. On this the friends of Acacius withdrew, and the rest, after shutting the doors

of

of the church in which they were aſſembled, ſubſcribed the creed of Antioch *.

After much altercation, the two parties were brought together again, and Acacius, by means of the emperor's officers, contrived that, after the excluſion of thoſe who had been accuſed, a creed which he had prepared ſhould be propoſed; and in this both the terms *homoouſios*, and *homoiouſios*, that is, *of the ſame*, or of *like ſubſtance*, as having been the occaſion of much diſturbance, were condemned; but it was aſſerted that the Son was *like the Father*, and that he was *begotten without paſſion before all ages*, and took fleſh of the virgin. Such a creed as this might have been ſubſcribed by almoſt all the contending parties. However it was not agreed to except by Acacius and his thirty followers.

The terms in which this creed (probably to avoid giving offence) was drawn up being ambiguous, a debate enſued to determine in what reſpects the Son was like the Father. The Acacians ſaid in *will* only, but the reſt in *ſubſtance*. This debate took up a whole day; and after reſuming it to no purpoſe, the imperial officers diſmiſſed the coun-

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. ii. Cap. 39, p. 149.

cil.

cil. The majority, however, did not leave the place but proceeded to examine thoſe who had been accuſed. They moreover pronounced ſentence of depoſition againſt Acacius, George of Alexandria, Uranius of Tyre, and many others. Some alſo they excommunicated, and among them was Aſterius, till they ſhould give ſatisfaction with reſpect to the crimes laid to their charge. After much more alteration on this and other ſubjects, the emperors officers returned to give an account of the proceedings to their maſter*.

Hilary of Poitiers, who was now in the fourth year of his baniſhment in Phrygia, was compelled to attend this council, and in it he gave an account of the faith of the Gallic church, which he declared to be agreeable to the deciſions of the council of Nice, whereas the biſhops of that country had been ſuſpected of Sabellianiſm †.

The emperor being returned to Conſtantinople, Acacius and his friends complained to him that the creed which they had preſented had not been received; and continuing ſome time in the city, they called a council of the biſhops of Bythinia, fifty in all, and

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. ii. Cap. 40. p. 151.

† Sulp. Severus, Lib ii. Cap. 42. p. 270.

among them Maris of Chalcedon, when they ſubſcribed the creed which had been preſented at Ariminum, with the alteration of a few words only, calling Chriſt *God of God*, rejecting the phraſe *of the ſame ſubſtance*, and adopting that of *like ſubſtance*, with the addition of the words *according to the ſcriptures*, to which the Aetians could not object, becauſe in the ſcriptures it is ſaid that man was made after the image of God, or like to God. They alſo rejected the word *hypoſtaſis*, as not mentioned in the ſcriptures *.

Thus the emperor in ſome meaſure gained his point, as his father had done before him. The Nicene creed, containing the phraſe *of the ſame ſubſtance*, had been ſubſcribed by the objecting party in the preceding reign, after ſome explanation; and ſo alſo had the phraſe *of like ſubſtance*, which was the Shiboleth of the preſent reign, been ſubſcribed by the oppoſite parties. But what ſignifies an agreement in words when mens ideas and opinions are really different.

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. ii. Cap. 41. p. 155.

SEC.

SECTION VII.

Tranſactions relating to Arianiſm ſubſequent to the Council of Seleucia, A. D. 359, and of the Council of Conſtantinople A. D. 360.

THOUGH the great object of Acacius and Eudoxius was the depoſition of their opponents, our hiſtorian obſerves that neither party, though they differed with reſpect to articles of faith, depoſed the others on that account, but only for crimes laid to their charge. Thus they depoſed Macedonius as having been the author of much bloodſhed, and becauſe he had admitted to communion a deacon taken in adultery. For crimes real or ſuppoſed (for ſome of them are too heinous to be eaſily credited) they depoſed Eleuſius of Cyzicum, Baſil of Ancyra, Neonas of Seleucia, Sophronius of Pompoiopolis, Elpidius of Satala in Armenia, Cyril of Jeruſalem, and many others *.

Theodoret gives a particular account of what paſſed between Conſtantius and the biſhops who repaired to Conſtantinople, at the ſecond dedication of the church of Sancta

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. ii. Cap. 42. p. 157.

Sophia,

Sophia*, from the council of Seleucia, which, if it may be depended upon, ſufficiently diſcovers the emperor's opinion and temper, and throws much light on the eccleſiaſtical hiſtory of this period. Acacius complaining of thoſe who compoſed the council at Seleucia, as being aſſembled for the ruin of the church, the emperor was much provoked at him; but more eſpecially for his accuſation of Cyril of Jeruſalem, on account of his ſelling a rich robe which Conſtantine had given to his church, and which had been afterwards bought by ſome players, and uſed on a public theatre. On this the emperor's friends adviſed him to aſſemble, not a council, but ten of the principal biſhops, of whom were Cæſarius of Armenia, Baſil of Galatia, Sylvanus of Tarſus, and Eleuſius of Cyzicum.

Theſe being aſſembled, adviſed the emperor to inquire into the blaſphemies and unjuſt proceedings of Eudoxius. But the emperor choſe firſt to diſcuſs the article of faith, and then proceed to the enquiry con-

* This was thirty four years after Conſtantine had laid the foundation of it. On this occaſion Conſtantius made rich preſents to the church, eſpecially veſſels of gold and ſilver. He alſo made valuable preſents to the clergy, to the virgins, the widows, and the hoſpitals. Fleury, A. D. 360.

cerning

cerning Eudoxius. On this Baſil preſuming upon the liberty which he had been uſed to take with the emperor, reproved him, in an ironical manner, as undermining the faith of the church. But Conſtantius, not taking it in good part, bade him be ſilent, and ſaid that he was always raiſing diſturbances. On this, Baſil ſaying nothing more, Euſtathius ſaid to the emperor, "Since you chuſe to diſcuſs "the articles of faith, ſee what blaſphemies "Eudoxius has uttered againſt Chriſt;" and at the ſame time preſented a treatiſe concerning faith, in which was the following paſſage: "Things that are produced in a different "manner, differ with reſpect to their ſub-"ſtance. But we read *there is one God the* "*Father*, OF WHOM *are all things, and one* "*Lord Jeſus Chriſt* BY WHOM *are all things.*" But the phraſes *by whom*, and *of whom* are diſſimilar, and therefore the Son muſt be diſſimilar with reſpect to the Father.

Conſtantius being much offended at this, and aſking Eudoxius if he wrote the book, he denied it, and ſaid it was written by Aetius, aſſiſted by George of Alexandria, who at that time reſided together with Eunomius at the houſe of Eudoxius. For when, on the death of Leontius, Eudoxius took poſſeſſion of the

ſee of Antioch, Aetius returned from Egypt, and brought Eunomius with him. Then the emperor ordered Aetius to be introduced, and ſhewing him the paſſage above mentioned, aſked him if that was his writing, when he, not knowing for what purpoſe the queſtion was put, acknowledged it; and in conſequence of it the emperor immediately baniſhed him to ſome place in Phrygia *.

Euſtathius, however, maintained that Eudoxius was of the ſame opinion with Aetius, alleging that Aetius was his gueſt, and lived in intimacy with him at the time of his writing the book; and in proof of this he alleged that nobody knew of Aetius writing it beſides Eudoxius. But the emperor ſaying that a judge ought to make proper inquiry before he determined, Euſtathius propoſed that Eudoxius ſhould ſatisfy them all that he did not approve of the treatiſe of Aetius, by pronouncing an anathema upon it. Conſtantius approving of this, Euſtathius began to make evaſions; but when he was threatened to be baniſhed, as well as Aetius, he no longer he-

* Philoſtorgius ſays that, when the emperor was informed by Acacius, that Aetius was well received by Auxentius biſhop of Mopſueſtia, whither he had been baniſhed, be ſent him to Amblas, that he might end his days miſerably through the barbarity of the inhabitants. Lib. v. Cap. 2. p. 506.

ſitated

ſitated to diſclaim the doctrine; though both before and afterwards he never ceaſed to defend it.

Eudoxius however, in his turn, objected to Euſtathius, and ſaid that for the ſame reaſons that he had given, he ought to condemn the word *conſubſtantial* as not being found in the ſcriptures. But Sylvanus replied, that there was the ſame reaſon for rejecting the phraſes of Chriſt being *made out of nothing*, a *creature* and of *another ſubſtance* from God. For ſince theſe phraſes do not occur in the ſcriptures, they ought not to be introduced into public worſhip. To this the emperor aſſented, and ordered Eudoxius to pronounce an anathema on thoſe phraſes.

At firſt they would have evaded it, but perceiving the emperor to be in earneſt, they very unwillingly pronounced the condemnation required; inſiſting however on the term *conſubſtantial* being condemned likewiſe. But Sylvanus with great ingenuity replied, "if God, the "word, be not *out of nothing*, nor *a creature*, nor "*of another ſubſtance*, he muſt be *of the ſame ſub-* "*ſtance* with God, as *God of God*, *light of light*, "having the ſame nature with his Father."

But, ſays our author, though he argued very juſtly, he did not convince any of them;

and a great clamour being raiſed by the faction of Acacius and Eudoxius, the emperor was angry, and threatened the other party to eject them from their churches. Then Eleuſius and Sylvanus, with ſome others, told the emperor that it was his buſineſs indeed to puniſh, but theirs to judge of piety and impiety, and that they would never betray the religion of their anceſtors. Though Conſtantius, ſays our author, ought to have admired theſe men for their courage, in defending the doctrine of the apoſtles, he baniſhed them from their reſpective ſees, and ordered other perſons to be put in their places. In conſequence of this Eudoxius got poſſeſſion of the ſee of Conſtantinople, and Eleuſius being baniſhed from Cyzicum, Eunomius was put in his place*.

When theſe tranſactions were over, Conſtantius ordered the biſhops who were aſſembled to paſs a ſentence of condemnation on Aetius in a formal writing; and on this, ſays

* Philoſtorgius ſays, that Baſil of Ancyra, and Euſtathius of Sebaſtia, accuſed Eudoxius and Aetius of favouring the party of Gallus, and that Conſtantius gave credit to them and the women, whom they had gained to their party. He adds, that more than ſeventy biſhops of Eudoxius's party were baniſhed by the contrivance of Baſil of Ancyra and his friends. Lib. iv. Cap. viii. p. 504.

our

our hiſtorian, the favourers of his impiety condemned their colleague. They even wrote to George biſhop of Alexandria, to inform him of what had been done againſt Aetius, at the ſame time that they ſent him the decrees of the ſynod. This letter, a copy of which was ſent to other biſhops, it may not be amiſs to produce, as a ſpecimen of ſuch writings.

"The holy ſynod aſſembled at Conſtanti-
"nople, to their dear brother George biſhop
"of Alexandria."

"In the condemnation of Aetius by the
"ſynod for his nefarious and ſcandalous writ-
"ings, the biſhops did what was agreeable
"to the eccleſiaſtical canons. He was de-
"poſed from his deaconſhip, and expelled
"from the church. We have likewiſe given
"admonitions, that his wicked epiſtles be
"not read, but rejected as uſeleſs; and have
"added that, if he do not retract his opinions,
"he and his followers ſhall be anathematiz-
"ed. In agreement with this all the bi-
"ſhops who were convened at this council
"ſhould have execrated him as the author of
"ſcandals, tumults, diſſenſions, univerſal
"murmuring, and ſedition among the
"churches, and have agreed in the ſentence

" that was paſſed upon him. But, contrary
" to our expectation, and that of every body,
" Serra, Stephanus, Heliodorus, Theophilus,
" and the reſt of the party, neither agreed to
" our ſuffrages, nor ſubſcribed the ſentence
" that we paſſed upon him, though Serra
" himſelf blamed another of the mad boaſt-
" ings of Aetius. For he ſaid he had the
" impudence to aſſert, that what God had
" concealed from the apoſtles, had been re-
" vealed to him.

" Yet, after giving teſtimony concerning
" theſe mad and arrogant ſpeeches of Aetius,
" the perſons above-mentioned could by no
" intreaties be prevailed upon to join us in the
" condemnation of him. We however,
" with ſingular patience, ſpared them a long
" time, urging and intreating them, by every
" mode of addreſs, to make the ſentence of the
" ſynod unanimous. But this being without
" any effect, thinking that the canons of the
" church ought to be preferred to their
" friendſhip, we have decreed that they ſhall
" be ſeparated from our communion; allow-
" ing them, however, the ſpace of ſix months
" for repentance and agreement with us.
" But if, within that time, they do not concur

" in

"in the condemnation of Aetius, we pro-
"nounce them depoſed from their epiſcopal
"dignity, and others muſt of courſe be put in
"their places, that the catholic church may
"be in agreement with itſelf; all the biſhops
"in all places keeping the bond of brotherly
"love, all ſaying the ſame thing, and having
"the ſame opinion and will.

"This we write to inform you of the de-
"crees of the ſynod, praying that, by adher-
"ing to them, you may govern the churches
"which are ſubject to you by the grace of
"Chriſt in peace, and according to order*."

From what paſſed at this council, at which the emperor was preſent, the reader may eaſily judge of the authority of councils in general. For we may take it for granted that princes and other perſons who have power, always direct ſuch aſſemblies as they pleaſe; ſo that their deciſions are by no means the ſerious deliberate opinions of the majority of the members, but the pleaſure of one or a few, and that generally dictated by their intereſt.

Macedonius, being expelled from Conſtantinople, joined thoſe biſhops who had depoſed Acacius at Seleucia, urging them to adhere to the creed of Antioch, in which the term

* Theod. Hiſt. Lib. ii. Cap. 27, &c. p. 110, &c.

of like ſubſtance was inſerted; and from that time this party was diſtinguiſhed by the name of *Homoiouſians*. They were alſo joined by Euſtathius, who had been expelled from Sebaſtia.

The friends of Acacius wiſhed to have another council, and the year following, viz. A. D. 360, the emperor himſelf being preſent, they were aſſembled at Antioch. But few of them were for calling in queſtion what had been decreed before; ſaying that the term *of like ſubſtance* ought to be expunged both from the creed of Ariminum, and that of Conſtantinople. In their debates on this occaſion they avowed that the Son was *unlike the Father both in ſubſtance and will*, and likewiſe *made out of nothing*, doctrines which were held by the diſciples of Aetius at Antioch. Being interrogated why they had ſubſcribed the other creeds in which the term (εκ θεϑ) *of God*, had been uſed? they ſaid, that according to the apoſtle *all things* are ſaid to be (εκ τϑ θεϑ) *of God*, and that for this reaſon they had added the words *according to the ſcriptures*. George of Laodicea was the inventor of this evaſion. The friends of Acacius, however, not inſiſting on what they had propoſed, nor chuſing to bear the reproach

proach of inconsistency, subscribed the creed of Constantinople, and then the bishops dismissed themselves *.

SECTION VIII.

Of the Method by which the Trinitarians distinguished themselves from the Arians at Antioch; and Observations on the Progress of Arianism in this Reign.

THE manner which the orthodox took to distinguish themselves from the heterodox, with respect to the doctrine of the trinity, by ascribing *glory to the Father, Son, and Spirit*, at the conclusion of their hymns, was begun at Antioch in this reign. The custom had been, Philostorgius says, to ascribe glory *to the Father by the Son in the Holy Spirit*, or, *in the Son and the Holy Spirit*, but that Flavianus of Antioch introduced the custom of ascribing glory *to the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit* †. Some, however, pronounced this doxology in one way, and others in another. In this difference

* Socratis Hist. Lib. ii. Cap. 45. p. 161.
† Ibid. Lib. iii. Cap. 13. p. 497.

Leontius

Leontius the biſhop did not chuſe to interfere, but, pointing to his grey hairs, ſaid, "when "this ſnow ſhall be diſſolved, much mud "will be left behind;" intimating, that when he ſhould be dead, much miſchief would ariſe from theſe party diſtinctions*.

The method of ſinging alternately here alluded to, was introduced into the church of Antioch by Flavianus and Diodorus, who had embraced a monkiſh mode of life, and who (as was ever after the caſe with the monks in general) were zealous for the higheſt orthodoxy of the times with reſpect to the doctrine of the trinity. Theſe men being very popular, threatened Leontius that they would leave his communion if he did not degrade Aetius, whom he had made a deacon, and it is ſaid that, in compliance with them, he did it, when in other reſpects he ſhewed him all the favour that he could; though Aetius himſelf ſaid that he quitted that church of his own accord.

Theſe two men, though not of the clergy, were continually taking the lead among the people in all pious exerciſes. They were the firſt who divided the choir of ſingers into two parts, and taught them to ſing the pſalms

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. iii. Cap. 20. p. 126.

of

of David in alternate verſes, a cuſtom which from Antioch ſpread itſelf to all chriſtian churches, in every part of the world. The chaunting in our cathedrals was derived from it. Theſe two men would often paſs the whole night with a number of people in the churches, ſinging pſalms in this new manner; and, at the requeſt of Leontius, they did the ſame in time of public worſhip *.

It is evident that, notwithſtanding Arianiſm took its riſe ſome time before the council of Nice, yet that nothing that we ſhould now think deſerving of the name, was openly avowed by any ſet of men till towards the cloſe of the reign of Conſtantius, when the *Aetians*, afterwards called *Eunomians*, profeſſed that, as the ſon was made out of nothing, he muſt be of a ſubſtance different from that of the Father. Nay, the proper opinions of Arius, viz. that the ſon was made out of nothing, and that there was a time when he did not exiſt, were really adopted by very few, if any, till the period of which we are now treating; and it is even not improbable that Arius himſelf receded from theſe opinions before he died; ſo that what we now call *Arianiſm*, roſe much later, and ſpread much

* Theod. Hiſt. Lib. ii. Cap. 24. p. 106.

leſs

leſs rapidly than has been generally imagined.

In all the councils of which we have ſeen an account in the reign of Conſtantius, we find creeds not materially different from that of Nice. For though the biſhops who compoſed ſome of them reprobated the term *conſubſtantial*, they adopted other phraſes that were nearly, if not altogether, equivalent to it. Conſequently the great body of the favourers of Arius did not entirely adopt his opinions, but rather favoured him as a man ill uſed, and one whoſe opinions had no great harm in them. They blamed the violence of his adverſaries, and ſeriouſly objected to the term *conſubſtantial*, as having been rejected by the firſt council of Antioch, and favouring the opinion of the divine eſſence being material. At the ſame time they really believed, with the Antinicene Fathers in general, that the logos was the perſonified attribute of the Father, and therefore not produced from any thing beſides *himſelf*, and therefore in all reſpects *like himſelf*.

It is not to be ſuppoſed that thoſe who actually ſubſcribed the Nicene creed, even after their being baniſhed for refuſing to do it, diſſembled their opinions, or ſubſcribed what they

they did not believe, but for the reaſons which they alleged, and which have been reported. With the explanations of the term *conſubſtantial* which accompanied their ſubſcriptions, I have no doubt that they were very ſincere. Beſides, if it could be ſuppoſed that there was an adequate motive for their hypocriſy in the reign of Conſtantine, there was no temptation to act the ſame hypocritical part in that of Conſtantius.

That Euſebius of Nicomedia, who had the confidence of Conſtantine in all the latter part of his life, and who, till the time of his death was the leader of that party which favoured Arius the moſt, was nevertheleſs far from being what we ſhould now call an Arian, may be ſafely concluded from the ſentiments of Euſebius of Cæſarea, who was of the ſame party, and who was always in high favour with Conſtantine. From his writings, which are numerous, there can be no doubt of his having been a believer in an *uncreated logos*, and of his having in all other reſpects held what had been generally deemed the orthodox doctrine concerning the perſon of Chriſt, till the council of Nice; though he probably did not adopt the opinion which aroſe in his own time, and which afterwards acquired the ſtamp

ſtamp of orthodoxy, viz. that of God having been *always a Father*, and therefore that of the Son having been always. This therefore I take to have been the caſe of Euſebius of Nicomedia and thoſe who were of his party.

Indeed the ſyſtem of Arianiſm cannot be ſaid to have been compleated till after the time of Apollinaris, who firſt maintained that in the incarnation the logos was united to a human body only, itſelf ſupplying the place of the intellectual principle, or the ſoul; or ſince the immaterial part of man was by many ſuppoſed to be two fold, conſiſting of νους, and ψυχη, the *intellectual* and *ſenſitive* part, the logos was in the place of the former of them. But as Apollinaris himſelf ſuppoſed the logos to be uncreated, he could not be called an Arian*. However, they who adopted his opinion of the logos ſupplying the place of a human ſoul in the perſon of Chriſt, and ſuppoſed with Arius that the logos was *created out of nothing*, were properly Arians, or ſuch as are now ſo denominated.

It is ſomething remarkable that, as the doctrine of a *created logos* followed that of an *uncreated* one in the perſon of Chriſt (ſo that Arianiſm, in the firſt of its elements, was

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. ii. Cap. 46, p. 163.

founded

founded upon trinitarianiſm) the Arians learned of Apollinaris, a trinitarian, to abandon the idea of a human ſoul in Chriſt. Without this, however, they muſt in time have come to the ſame concluſion, in reflecting upon their principles, and the natural conſequences of them.

Before the end of this reign, the followers of Aetius, or rather of Eunomius, ſeparated themſelves from thoſe who had been called Arians, and came to have a ſeparate denomination, in the following manner, as related by Theodoret. Notwithſtanding the forced condemnation of Aetius by Eudoxius and Acacius, he continued to live in friendſhip with them, and was by them advanced to the rank of biſhop. Eunomius having got poſſeſſion of the church of Cyzicum, while Eleuſius their former biſhop was ſtill living, Eudoxius, who well knew the ſentiments of the people, as well as the averſion which the emperor had to his opinions, adviſed him to conceal them as much as he could for the preſent. But though he did this, he was brought by a ſtratagem to declare himſelf openly in the church, and this gave occaſion to his adverſaries to accuſe him before the emperor,

ſtamp of orthodoxy, viz. that of God having been *always a Father*, and therefore that of the Son having been always. This therefore I take to have been the caſe of Euſebius of Nicomedia and thoſe who were of his party.

Indeed the ſyſtem of Arianiſm cannot be ſaid to have been compleated till after the time of Apollinaris, who firſt maintained that in the incarnation the logos was united to a human body only, itſelf ſupplying the place of the intellectual principle, or the ſoul; or ſince the immaterial part of man was by many ſuppoſed to be two fold, conſiſting of νους, and ψυχη, the *intellectual* and *ſenſitive* part, the logos was in the place of the former of them. But as Apollinaris himſelf ſuppoſed the logos to be uncreated, he could not be called an Arian*. However, they who adopted his opinion of the logos ſupplying the place of a human ſoul in the perſon of Chriſt, and ſuppoſed with Arius that the logos was *created out of nothing*, were properly Arians, or ſuch as are now ſo denominated.

It is ſomething remarkable that, as the doctrine of a *created logos* followed that of an *uncreated* one in the perſon of Chriſt (ſo that Arianiſm, in the firſt of its elements, was

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. ii. Cap. 46, p. 163.

founded

founded upon trinitarianiſm) the Arians learned of Apollinaris, a trinitarian, to abandon the idea of a human ſoul in Chriſt. Without this, however, they muſt in time have come to the ſame concluſion, in reflecting upon their principles, and the natural conſequences of them.

Before the end of this reign, the followers of Aetius, or rather of Eunomius, ſeparated themſelves from thoſe who had been called Arians, and came to have a ſeparate denomination, in the following manner, as related by Theodoret. Notwithſtanding the forced condemnation of Aetius by Eudoxius and Acacius, he continued to live in friendſhip with them, and was by them advanced to the rank of biſhop. Eunomius having got poſſeſſion of the church of Cyzicum, while Eleuſius their former biſhop was ſtill living, Eudoxius, who well knew the ſentiments of the people, as well as the averſion which the emperor had to his opinions, adviſed him to conceal them as much as he could for the preſent. But though he did this, he was brought by a ſtratagem to declare himſelf openly in the church, and this gave occaſion to his adverſaries to accuſe him before the emperor,

who ordered Eudoxius to inquire into the caſe, and to depoſe him if the allegation was true. After many delays, Eudoxius found himſelf obliged to do this, but notwithſtanding all his apologies, Eunomius complained of being ill uſed by him; and from that time he formed ſeparate congregations, and his followers were called *Eunomians* *.

The Eunomians, as I have already obſerved, where the firſt Arians who properly avowed that Chriſt was *a creature*, ſo as to be of a nature *unlike* that of God. Still, however, it does not appear that as yet even theſe Arians had any idea that their created logos ſupplied the place of a human ſoul in the perſon of Chriſt. It is probable that for a long time this logos was ſuppoſed to poſſeſs the mind of Chriſt in much the ſame manner as the Gnoſtic Chriſt was ſuppoſed to have taken poſſeſſion of the man Jeſus, or as dæmons were imagined to take poſſeſſion of men, being a principle ſuperadded to the ſoul and body in conjunction.

The Arians ſpread themſelves not only through all the provinces of the Roman empire, but among the barbarous nations alſo, both in this and the preceding reign. Among

* Theod. Hiſt. Lib. ii. Cap. 29. p. 114.

thoſe

thoſe who were carried captive by the Goths from Aſia Minor, in the time of Gallienus, were the anceſtors of Ulphilas of Cappadocia. This Ulphilas, being ſent ambaſſador, among other perſons, from the king of the Goths to Conſtantine, was ordained biſhop of the Goths by Euſebius of Nicomedia, and his friends. He tranſlated into the Gothic language almoſt all the books of ſcripture, and was highly eſteemed by Conſtantine, who was uſed to call him the Moſes of the age, though he was an Arian, as well as the Goths who were inſtructed by him*.

Philoſtorgius ſays that the Indians who had been converted to chriſtianity by the apoſtle Bartholomew, held that the Son was unlike the Father, and that Theophilus, an Indian, informed the Arians in the Roman empire that ſuch was their opinion. This however he would naturally ſay, if they had been properly *Unitarians*, which was moſt probably the caſe. For, believing Chriſt to be a mere man, they muſt of courſe have thought that his nature was unlike that of God, as much as the Arians did concerning their logos. The people who are here called Indians were not thoſe of Indoſtan, but a people of Arabia Felix, near

* Philoſtorgii Hiſt. Lib. ii. Cap. 5. p. 480.

the ſea coaſt, being the ſame that are called Sabæans, and likewiſe Homerites *.

This Theophilus was ſent ambaſſador by Conſtantius to the king of the Homerites, on purpoſe to engage him to embrace the chriſtian religion; and it is ſaid that he ſucceeded, and built three churches in that country †. After this Theophilus proceeded farther, and corrected whatever he found to be amiſs in the churches already eſtabliſhed in India; but he had no occaſion to rectify their opinion concerning Chriſt, as they had always conſidered him as being of a ſubſtance unlike that of the Father ‡. After this Theophilus returned into the Roman territories, where he was much eſteemed by the emperor, though he had no biſhoprick aſſigned him.

* Phil. Lib. ii. Cap. 6. p. 481. Lib. iii. Cap. 4. p. 486.
† Lib. iii. Cap. 4. p. 488.
‡ Lib. iii. Cap. 5. p. 488.

SEC.

SECTION IX.

Of the Death and Character of Conſtantius.

CONSTANTIUS, hearing that Julian, after being ſucceſsful in his wars in Gaul, had, without his conſent, accepted the title of *Emperor* and *Auguſtus* from the army, began to march againſt him from Antioch, where he was when he heard the news; and finding himſelf indiſpoſed on his march through Cilicia was baptized, which, like his Father, he had omitted to be before: but being ſeized with an apoplexy, he died in the fortieth year of his age, and the twenty-fifth of his reign*.

Conſtantius, like his father, was no doubt very ſincere in his profeſſion of chriſtianity, and had the beſt intentions in his endeavours to aid it by civil power. But his reign, like that of his father, affords a ſtriking leſſon of the riſque that chriſtianity runs in ſuch an alliance with the kingdoms of this world. What did it produce in this caſe but diſcord inſtead of harmony, and miſchiefs of every

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. ii. Cap. 47. p. 164.

kind, with whatever is moſt contrary to the ſpirit and practice of chriſtianity. So far, however, was Conſtantius from having perceived the impropriety of his conduct in this reſpect, that Philoſtorgius ſays that juſt before his death, he had appointed another council to meet at Nice, in order to examine the opinions of thoſe who held that the Son was of a ſubſtance different from that of the Father. Acacius, he ſays, having accuſed Eunomius and Eudoxius, the emperor ſent for the former to Antioch, and there called a ſynod to examine the charge againſt him; but no accuſer appearing, the emperor was much diſpleaſed with Acacius, and reſerved the diſcuſſion of the affair to the future council*.

The private life of Conſtantius was in the main irreproachable, though, like many other well meaning princes, he had the weakneſs to be influenced by favourites, and to be governed by paſſion. That he had a ſtrong ſenſe of religion, though mixed with ſuperſtition, appeared in a remarkable manner when he was marching againſt Magnentius. For, aſſembling his troops, he exhorted them all to be baptized; telling them that life was always uncertain, but eſpecially ſo in war; and

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. v. Cap. 5. p. 511.

he ordered all thoſe to return home who did not chuſe to comply, as he was determined that none ſhould fight under him who were not baptized*. This ſtory (which, I ſee no reaſon to queſtion the truth of) is the more remarkable, as at that time the emperor himſelf was not baptized. But he might not think himſelf in ſo much perſonal danger as thoſe who fought under him.

SECTION X.

Of the Perſecution of Chriſtians in Perſia, in the Reign of Conſtantius, A. D. 343.

THE perſecution of chriſtians was by no means confined to the Roman empire. Similar cauſes neceſſarily produce ſimilar effects in all places; and chriſtianity was equally hoſtile to every ſpecies of idolatry, with all of which it had been taken for granted that the welfare of the ſtates in which they were practiſed was connected. The progreſs of it, therefore, could not fail to give

* Theod. Hiſt. Lib. iii. Cap. 3. p. 125.

general alarm, and eſpecially would it highly irritate thoſe who were immediate gainers by the old ſuperſtitions; which muſt have been the caſe with great numbers in all civilized and opulent countries, in all of which large funds were appropriated to the ſupport of religion, funds from which ſeveral perſons of conſiderable rank and conſequence derived great emoluments.

The reaſon why we have fewer accounts of perſecutions without the bounds of the Roman empire, is becauſe there were no writers at that time in thoſe countries, at leaſt that are come down to us. By means of the Greek writers, however, we know ſome little of what was tranſacted in the countries bordering upon the Roman empire, with which the Greeks and Romans had always ſome intercourſe. We have, for example, a tolerably authentic account of the perſecution of chriſtians by Sapor II. king of Perſia, in this period, viz. A. D. 343.

When the chriſtians were conſiderably increaſed in Perſia, the Magi and the Jews in conjunction, who were equally irritated againſt them, in order to inſtigate Sapor to perſecute them, accuſed Simeon biſhop of Seleucia, and Cteſiphon, of being an enemy to

Perſia,

Perſia, and of giving intelligence concerning the ſtate of it to the Romans. In conſequence of this information, Sapor, ſuſpecting all the chriſtians of the ſame diſaffection, loaded them with heavy taxes, deſtroyed their churches, and confiſcated their ſacred veſſels, &c. He moreover ſentenced all the clergy to death; and when Simeon, who was brought into his preſence, refuſed even to proſtrate himſelf before him, as had been the cuſtom with reſpect to the kings of Perſia, or conſent to worſhip the ſun, he was ſubjected to grievous torture, which he bore with great fortitude.

While he was in priſon, Uſtazades, a favourite eunuch of the king, being mortified at the indignation with which Simeon treated him on account of his conforming to the idolatry of the country, out of complaiſance to the king, reſolutely declared himſelf a chriſtian, and was put to death, and afterwards an hundred others, all either biſhops, or of ſome order of the clergy; and, being aſſiſted by the exhortations of Simeon, they ſhewed the greateſt conſtancy. Laſtly himſelf, and two other old men, Abdechalaas and Ananias, were put to death. Alſo Puſices, the chief of the king's artizans, being per-

ceived to encourage Ananias, was not only put to death, together with his daughter, who was a nun, but previous to his execution, he had his tongue torn out in a peculiarly cruel manner.

The year following, about the time of Eaſter, Sapor ordered that not only the clergy, but all his chriſtian ſubjects without exception, ſhould ſuffer death; and then the number of martyrs was prodigious; the Magi being aſſiduous in their accuſations, and the chriſtians not declining what they called the crown of martyrdom. On this occaſion many of the courtiers ſuffered, and particularly Azadas, a favourite eunuch, whoſe death affected the king ſo much, that from this time he confined the perſecution of the chriſtians to the clergy.

About the ſame time ſome Jews accuſed Tarbula, the ſiſter of Simeon above-mentioned (who, together with two other women, had devoted herſelf to a ſingle life) of cauſing the illneſs of the queen, by means of ſome charms, in revenge for the death of her brother. The queen being inclined to judaiſm, gave credit to the accuſation; and in conſequence of this, all the three were put to death, by being ſawn through the body.

This

This perſecution by king Sapor fell the heavieſt on the province of Adiabene, where the chriſtians were very numerous. Acepſimas, a biſhop, and many of his clergy were ſeized at the ſame time. But the perſecutors contenting themſelves with the biſhop, diſmiſſed the inferior clergy, after confiſcating all their effects. James, however, a preſbyter, choſe to remain with his ſuperior, and miniſtered to him in the cruel uſage to which he was expoſed, in conſequence of his refuſing to worſhip the ſun. Acepſimas was tortured to death, but ſome Armenians privately conveyed away his remains, and buried them. Others of the clergy were cruelly tortured, but ſurvived; and one of them, Aithalas, a preſbyter, had his arms ſo ſtretched, that he never recovered the uſe of them.

The number of clergy who ſuffered martyrdom in this perſecution was very great. Sozomen has preſerved the names of twenty-two of the biſhops; and he ſays that all the martyrs, including men and women, were ſuppoſed to amount to no leſs than ſixteen thouſand *.

Sozomen places this perſecution in the reign of Conſtantine, and ſuppoſes him to

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. ii. Cap. 9. 15. p. 56, &c.

have

have written the *letter to Sapor*, mentioned before, on this occaſion. But as neither Euſebius, nor any cotemporary writer, ſpeaks of any particular perſecution of the chriſtians in Perſia at that time, it is moſt probable that it was in the ſeventh of Conſtantius, where Jerom, in his Chronicle, places ſuch a perſecution, as was noticed by Baronius *.

SECTION XI.

Of the Donatiſts in this Reign.

IT is probable that the Donatiſts kept increaſing in number during this reign, through the whole of which they continued to be perſecuted, as they had been in the reign of Conſtantine.

The emperor Conſtans, in whoſe government Africa was, actuated by the zeal of his family for the *peace of the church* ſent two perſons of rank, Paul and Macarius, A. D. 348, to endeavour to conciliate the Donatiſts, and at the ſame time to diſtribute alms to the poor. But the Donatiſts were not to be conciliated, and it is ſaid oppoſed theſe ambaſſa-

* Annales, A. D. 343.

dor

dors by force, the Circumcilliones intercepting their donations. To all their overtures for peace, they replied, *Quid eſt imperatori cum eccleſia*, "What has the emperor to do with the church;" an excellent ſaying, and worthy to be adopted by all chriſtians, though on this occaſion it might have been prompted by the injuries the Donatiſts had received from the emperor*.

About the end of the reign of Conſtans, A.D. 349, a council was held at Carthage, where Gratus was biſhop, in which canons were made againſt the Donatiſts' practice of rebaptizing, and againſt conſidering thoſe of them as martyrs who deſtroyed themſelves by by throwing themſelves from precipices, &c†. It is obvious to remark that, if any of them did this, it is a proof that they were driven to it by extreme deſpair, in conſequence of the greateſt violence. For the Donatiſts were *men*, and no men will voluntarily deſtroy themſelves if they be permitted to live in peace.

* Optatus, Lib. iii. p. 66.

It was alſo uſual with them to ſay *Quid chriſtianis cum regibus, aut quid epiſcopis cum palatio?* "What "have chriſtians to do with kings, or what have biſhops "to do at court? Ibid. Sect. i. p. 25.

† Binnii Concilia, Vol. i. p. 456.

SEC-

SECTION XII.

Of the Monks in this Reign.

I HAVE made ſome mention of Anthony, the firſt of the monks of Egypt, in a former period. His fame was ſo great, that he had many imitators, not only in Lybia and Egypt, but alſo in Paleſtine, Syria, and Arabia. They all adopted the ſame courſe of life that he had done, and like him had many followers. But the moſt eminent of his diſciples was Paul, who joined Anthony on his wife proving unfaithful to him*.

Cotemporary with this Paul, was Ammon, who led the ſame monaſtic life in Egypt, and whoſe wife (with whom however he never had any commerce) followed the ſame mode of life, and was the firſt woman who did ſo. They lived in ſeparate places near the lake Mareotis, and ſaw one another twice a year. He was the founder of many monaſteries in that part of the world. Another eminent Monk, or rather Anchorite, in the time of Conſtantine, was Eutychianus, a Novatian,

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. i. Cap. 13, p. 29.

who

who reſided near mount Olympus in Bythinia*.

Euſtathius, biſhop of Sebaſte in Armenia, was a great advocate for ſuch maxims and obſervances as diſtinguiſhed the monks, preſcribing rules concerning diet, dreſs, &c. It is ſaid that the book of monkiſh diſcipline, which was commonly aſcribed to Baſil of Cappadocia, was in reality written by him. His ſeverity was ſo great that it led him to violate the eſtabliſhed rules of the church. It is even ſaid that he condemned marriage, that his diſciples, at leaſt, refuſed to pray in the houſe of a married perſon, that they led ſome women to forſake their huſbands, and even to dreſs themſelves like men. On this account the neighbouring biſhops aſſembled at Gangræ in Paphlagonia, and condemned all thoſe peculiarities; and after this Euſtathius himſelf, to ſhew that he was not refractory, conformed to the uſual cuſtoms†. The council is ſuppoſed to have been held after this period, viz. A. D. 377.

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. i. Cap. 14. p. 29.
† Ibid. Lib. iii. Cap. 14. p. 115.

SECT.

SECTION XIII.

Of the Chriſtian Writers from the Acceſſion of Conſtantine, to the Death of Conſtantius.

THE writers within this period are ſufficiently numerous; but as, from this time, I ſhall not think it neceſſary, in general, to take notice of any beſides the more conſiderable of thoſe whoſe works are come down to us, I have not many to give an account of.

Arnobius was a native of Sicca in Africa, a teacher of rhetoric, and at firſt a ſtrenuous defender of the heathen religion; but after his converſion to chriſtianity, he wrote one of the beſt treatiſes now extant againſt it.

Lactantius was a native of Italy, and a diſciple of Arnobius, but was removed to Nicomedia by Diocletian, when he wiſhed to make that city equal to Rome, and to introduce into it the liberal arts. Having few diſciples, he employed himſelf chiefly in compoſing books, and he firſt diſtinguiſhed himſelf by his defence of chriſtianity againſt Hierocles, the preſident of Syria. He was afterwards made tutor to Criſpus the ſon of Conſtantine. We have of him ſeveral treatiſes,

treatiſes, which are ſo arranged as to have the title of *Inſtitutions*, comprehending a ſyſtem of chriſtianity, and morals. We have alſo an epitome of the whole in a ſeparate treatiſe. He is the moſt elegant of all the Latin chriſtian writers.

The moſt valuable writer in this period is Euſebius biſhop of Cæſarea in Paleſtine, ſurnamed Pamphilus, on account of his friendſhip for Pamphilus the Martyr. He ſeems to have been maſter of all the knowledge of his age, and he had the particular confidence of Conſtantine, as appears by ſeveral of his letters to him, which he has preſerved.

We have of this writer an eccleſiaſtical hiſtory in ten books, the only work of the kind now extant of that age, beginning with the origin of chriſtianity, and deſcribing its progreſs to the time of Conſtantine. The early part of it is very imperfect, no doubt for want of materials. The manner in which he expreſſes himſelf with reſpect to all thoſe whoſe ſentiments he diſapproved ſhews that he may be juſtly ſuſpected of partiality, and it certainly affects every thing he ſays concerning Unitarians of every kind. Indeed, two of his works are on the ſubject of this controverſy, being written to confute Marcellus of Ancyra.

He

He likewiſe wrote a Chronicon, or chronology from the time of Abraham to that of Conſtantine, of which we have an imperfect copy in the Latin of Ruffinus. But the moſt learned works of Euſebius are his *Preparation and Demonſtration of the goſpel*, in which he defends the cauſe of chriſtianity, againſt heathens and Jews. We have likewiſe a particular treatiſe of his againſt Hierocles, in anſwer to what he had written againſt the chriſtians, the *life of Conſtantine* in four books, an *oration in praiſe of Conſtantine* recited on his preſence on the thirtieth anniverſary of his reign, a *commentary on the pſalms and on Iſaiah;* and, in the Latin of Ruffinus, the firſt book of an *apology for Origen*, written by himſelf and Pamphilus in conjunction.

Among the writers and great men of this period, we muſt place Hierax of Leontopolis in Egypt, a perſon well ſkilled, according to Epiphanius, in all ſcience, and eſpecially in medicine, and who wrote in both the Greek and Egyptian languages. He was ſo well acquainted with the Old and New Teſtament, that he had them as it were by heart, and he wrote commentaries on them. He was particularly revered for the ſtrictneſs of his virtue, abſtaining from wine and all dainties,

ſo

ſo that many of the monks of Egypt adopted his opinions, which were in ſome reſpects thoſe of the Gnoſtics, as he denied the reſurrection of the fleſh, and reprobated marriage. The former of theſe he is ſaid to have borrowed from Origen, and the latter was held by many who pretended to great purity. He had followers who bore his name, and who are by ſome, but unjuſtly, ranked among the Manicheans. He lived to an extreme age, ſome ſay above ninety, retaining the perfect uſe of his eyes, and employing himſelf much in writing books, which he did in a very fair hand. Beſides his commentaries on the ſcriptures, he wrote on the work of the ſix days, but nothing of his is now extant *.

The emperor Conſtantine himſelf muſt alſo have a place among the writers of his age, on account of the many letters of his which have been preſerved by Euſebius and other writers, and eſpecially his *oration to the congregation of ſaints*, or the chriſtian church, in which he defends chriſtianity, and the orthodoxy of the times concerning the perſon of Chriſt.

* Epiph. Hær. 67. Opera. Vol. i. p. 710, &c.

PERIOD IX.

THE REIGN OF JULIAN.

SECTION I.

General Obſervations.

IF ever a wiſh could ariſe in the breaſt of a chriſtian, for a heathen and perſecuting emperor, it would be after peruſing ſuch a hiſtory as we have been conſidering, of the factions among the chriſtian biſhops during the reign of Conſtantius. Indeed, had there been nothing in chriſtianity, beſides what appears upon the face of this part of our hiſtory, it would not be worth contending for. But all hiſtories preſerve the accounts of the turbulent, and in general the worſt part of our ſpecies, of every deſcription, civil as well as religious, while the quiet, the inoffenſive, the benevolent, and truly virtuous characters walk in a ſphere in which they very rarely attract much notice, and are therefore ſoon forgotten.

gotten. More eſpecially would this be the caſe with chriſtianity, the principles of which led men to cultivate ſuch virtues as made no figure in the buſtle of the world.

Notwithſtanding all that we have ſeen of the factious and unchriſtian ſpirit which prevailed among the more conſpicuous of the biſhops, even Julian, whoſe hiſtory is now coming before us, and whoſe teſtimony in this reſpect cannot be excepted againſt, bears witneſs to the exemplary morals of the chriſtians in general, and even thoſe of their miniſters, as greatly ſuperior to thoſe of the heathens and their prieſts; and to this circumſtance chiefly he aſcribes the progreſs that, to his great regret, chriſtianity made in the world.

Compared with the diſpoſition of the generality of chriſtians, the heathens knew nothing, in a manner, even of benevolence, and much leſs of piety. For the latter, indeed, their religion afforded them no object; and it was unqueſtionably a ſenſe of their common relation to God, and to Chriſt, and their conſidering themſelves as joint heirs of a happy immortality, which inſpired that ardent and generous benevolence, which was unknown in the world before the promulgation

of chriſtianity. *How theſe chriſtians love one another*, was always, and indeed juſtly, the wonder of the heathens; and their general benevolence towards all mankind, without excluding even their enemies, was a new thing alſo; the attachments of the heathens having been always limited to their relations, particular friends, their country, or ſome other near and ſmall object. We have ſeen how, in time of diſtreſs and peſtilence, the generality of the heathens deſerted even their neareſt relations and friends, rather than run any riſque to ſave them. And, indeed, to a man whoſe proſpects are bounded by this life, what could juſtify the riſque of it?

On the other hand, the principles of chriſtianity, which in the courſe of this hiſtory have been abundantly exhibited, led men to make no account of life, or of any of the advantages or diſadvantages of it, when they came in competition with their known duty. Nay, many of the chriſtians, we have ſeen, were improperly laviſh of their lives, and, contrary to the expreſs commands of Chriſt (who was no enthuſiaſt, like many of his followers) courted perſecution, and were as ambitious of the honour of martyrdom, as many are of crowns. The uniform operation

tion of theſe principles, heathen philoſophers and emperors viewed with aſtoniſhment, but at the ſame time with hatred, as a thing of which they were not capable. Theſe principles were entertained by all ſincere chriſtians, and they increaſed their attachment to each other, and gave ſuch a generoſity and energy to their ſentiments, and conduct, as in the eyes of heathens muſt have made them appear a ſuperior kind of beings with reſpect to themſelves; and, independently of their future glorious proſpects, they were, and appeared to be, infinitely happier even here, when deſtitute of all worldly advantages, than their perſecutors were in the enjoyment of them.

Theſe virtues diſtinguiſhed the great maſs of chriſtians, who were not within the influence of worldly ambition, as the leading biſhops and clergy were; and even theſe men, notwithſtanding their great failings, were in general actuated by a ſincere love of truth, though they adopted improper methods of promoting it. The moſt factious of them were not deſtitute of ſincere piety, and even of benevolence, when they were not (as was too often unhappily the caſe) influenced by human paſſions, and led by uncommon in-

centives to indulge a ſpirit of pride and ambition. And it ſhould be conſidered, that to have the command of ſo much wealth and power as many of the chriſtian biſhops were in poſſeſſion of, eſpecially in the time of the chriſtian emperors, was a great temptation to perſons bred in obſcurity, as many of the more eminent of the biſhops and clergy were.

In their moſt eager conteſts for pre-eminence, the chriſtian biſhops, in theſe factious times, were not inferior to the generality of ſtateſmen and warriors; and when the profeſſion of chriſtianity became honourable and lucrative, it muſt be ſuppoſed that many would claſs with chriſtians, who had nothing of their religion but the name, and whoſe ſole object was the temporary advantages which it happened to be the means of procuring them. Such men as theſe ought not to be conſidered as chriſtians; becauſe, with the ſame diſpoſition of mind, and the ſame proſpects in this life, they would have profeſſed any other religion.

Let us not then think lightly of the advantages of chriſtianity, when we conſider the effects of thoſe human paſſions, which, in certain circumſtances, the principles of it might not be able to controul. In every ſitua-

tion chriſtianity did ſomething in favour of thoſe who really believed it. It contributed to improve their characters, though it did not always remove every defect. The good ſeed was ſometimes choaked with thorns, and in other caſes could hardly be diſtinguiſhed among the tares which grew up with it; but, in favourable circumſtances, it produced much good fruit, and ſuch as nothing elſe could have yielded.

In the extremely low, and lamentably corrupted ſtate to which chriſtianity ſunk in later ages, ſo as, in its external appearance, to reſemble that very idolatry over which it triumphed, both in its objects and mode of worſhip, it was, radically and internally, infinitely ſuperior to it, as it directed mens views to a ſtate beyond the grave, and with a view to that ſtrongly inculcated the government of the paſſions. Profeſſions have always ſome influence on practice; and the monks in every age profeſſed, and, in general, I doubt not, ſincerely endeavoured, to cultivate, amidſt all their abſurd mortifications, that humility, charity, piety, and heavenly mindedneſs, to which the heathens made no pretenſions at all. Many of their rites conſiſted in the groſſeſt ſenſual indulgence, and the moſt indecent ex-

hibitions, eſpecially thoſe in which Bacchus and Venus were the objects of worſhip; ſuch as the rudeſt populace among chriſtians, in any age, would have turned from with abhorrence. How prejudiced then muſt that man be, and how much to be pitied, who can at this day give the preference to the worſhip of the heathens, and fancy it to have the recommendation of *elegance*, and whoſe writings infuſe thoſe prejudices into others, who are deſtitute of ſufficient knowledge of antiquity to be upon their guard againſt them.

SECTION II.

Of the Superſtition of Julian.

THE reign that we are now going to take a view of was ſhort, but of great importance in the hiſtory of chriſtianity. It was its laſt and ſucceſsful ſtruggle againſt heatheniſm, which, though ſupported by a man of conſiderable ability and addreſs, and who gave his whole mind to the ſubject, yet appeared in his conduct as deſpicable, and as malevo-

malevolent, as ever it had done before. With reſpect to himſelf, it is lamentable to obſerve how an attachment to heatheniſm depraved a mind which was naturally far from being bad, and how it led a ſenſible man to adopt meaſures which, for their meanneſs, as well as their injuſtice and cruelty, every man of ſenſe muſt now condemn.

Julian was educated a chriſtian, and kept by his uncle, with perhaps too much care, from having acceſs to any heathen maſters. However, when he was at Nicomedia, where he was forbidden to attend the lectures of Libanius, his orations, which fell into his hands, gave him particular pleaſure. But ſtill he diſcovered no fondneſs for the heathen religion, though he was ſo great an admirer of the heathen writings, which would tend to recommend it to him, till the arrival of Maximus of Epheſus, of whom he both learned the rudiments of philoſophy, and acquired a reliſh for the religion to which his maſter was bigottedly attached. Leſt his propenſity to heatheniſm ſhould be ſuſpected, he got his head ſhorn, and pretended a great fondneſs for the monaſtic life. He alſo became a reader in the church of Nicomedia; and he diſſembled ſo well, that his chriſtian friends do not

appear

appear in the leaſt to have ſuſpected that he was any other than they wiſhed him to be.

Afterwards, being permitted to ſtudy philoſophy at Athens, he had a better opportunity of learning the rites of his new religion, and of hearing the ſneers of the heathen philoſophers againſt chriſtianity. There alſo he was initiated into thoſe *myſteries* to which all perſons had not acceſs, and might learn thoſe arts of divination and magic, which were always a flattering part of the heathen religion, and to which he was moſt ſuperſtitiouſly addicted.

How Julian acquitted himſelf as a military commander in Gaul it is not my buſineſs particularly to relate. It is ſufficient to ſay that he was the terror of his enemies, and that he gained the affections of his ſoldiers, ſo that they gave him the title of *Emperor* and *Auguſtus*. But before this, as ſoon as he began to feel his power, he acted independently of his uncle (who had diſcovered an imprudent jealouſy of him) and no longer concealed his attachment to heatheniſm, but opened the temples in the cities through which he paſſed, offering ſacrifices, celebrating feſtivals, and aſſuming the title of *Pontifex Maximus*. It was afterwards pretended by the heathens

heathens that, while he was in Gaul, he was induced to take up arms againſt his uncle by prophecies and oracles, which foretold the death of Conſtantius, and his own advancement to the empire*.

On the death of his uncle, Julian marched directly to Conſtantinople, which was the place of his nativity, where he was received without oppoſition, and where he behaved in ſuch a manner as to acquire great popularity, redreſſing many public wrongs, and puniſhing the authors of them; and though he did not conceal his own attachment to heatheniſm, he behaved at firſt with the greateſt moderation and impartiality towards his chriſtian ſubjects; and he pleaſed many of them by recalling from baniſhment the biſhops whom his uncle had capriciouſly depoſed, and reſtoring them to their ſees. He wrote to Baſil and Gregory (who will ſoon make a great figure in this hiſtory) with whom he had ſtudied at Athens, inviting them, among other perſons of diſtinguiſhed ability and learning, to his court, but probably with a view to engage them in his deſigns. This flattering invitation, however, they declined, from the unfavourable opinion they had conceived of him,

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. v. Cap. 1. p. 177.

and

and eſpecially the marks of levity, inconſtancy, and vanity which they had ſeen in him; indications not of a great, but of a little mind.

Julian gained the applauſe of many by his reforms in the imperial houſhold, from which he cut off all ſuperfluous expence, by his contempt of all pomp, which however he carried to an extreme that was unbecoming the dignity of an emperor, by his application to ſtudy, and the harrangues which he made in the ſenate, ſuch as no emperor had attempted ſince the time of Julius Cæſar. His patronage of learned men, and eſpecially the heathen philoſophers, brought great numbers of them to his court, eſpecially his tutor Maximus, to whom he behaved with the reſpect of a child to a father. Theſe men, who were his only aſſociates, contributed not a little to flatter his vanity, which was the predominant foible of his character.

An anecdote which we find in Eunapius*, concerning the manner in which Maximus went to the court of Julian, may give us an idea of the ſpirit and folly of heatheniſm. Preſently after his arrival at Conſtantinople, Julian ſent meſſengers to Maximus and Chryſanthius, who married the couſin of Eunapius,

* Vita Maximi, p. 77.

the

the writer of this account. They were both at Sardis; and having much experience in the art of divination, they had recourſe to the gods to direct them how to proceed. The omens were ſo unpromiſing that Chryſanthius was terrified and diſcouraged; but Maximus, whoſe inclination to comply with the flattering requeſt was probably ſtronger than that of Chryſanthius, ſaid that he had forgotten the rules of their diſcipline, which they had learned from their childhood, which was not to be diſcouraged by the firſt repulſes, but to uſe violence with the gods (εκβιαζεσθαι την τ̃ θειᾳ φυσιν) till they obtained their requeſt. Chryſanthius replied that, if *he* had the courage to perſiſt, he might; but that for himſelf, he could not reſiſt the preſages they had ſeen. Maximus, however, perſiſted, till at length he obtained the omen that he wanted. The remainder of the account I ſhall give in the words of Mr. Gibbon*, as I might be ſuſpected of wiſhing to give an unfavourable idea of the boaſted philoſophy of the heathens.

"The journey of Maximus through the "cities of Aſia diſplayed the triumph of phi- "loſophic vanity; and the magiſtrates vied "with each other in the honourable reception

* Vol ii. p. 378.

"which

" which they prepared for the friend of their
" ſovereign: Julian was pronouncing an ora-
" tion before the ſenate when he was inform-
" ed of the arrival of Maximus. The empe-
" ror immediately interrupted his diſcourſe,
" advanced to meet him, and after a tender
" embrace conducted him by the hand into
" the midſt of the aſſembly, where he pub-
" licly acknowledged the benefits which he
" had derived from the inſtructions of the
" philoſopher."

" Maximus, who ſoon acquired the confi-
" dence, and influenced the councils, of Juli-
" an, was inſenſibly corrupted by the temp-
" tations of a court. His dreſs became more
" ſplendid, his demeanour more lofty, and he
" was expoſed under a ſucceeding reign to a
" diſgraceful inquiry into the means by which
" the diſciple of Plato had accumulated, in
" the ſhort duration of his favour, a very
" ſcandalous proportion of wealth. Of the
" other philoſophers and ſophiſts who were
" invited to the imperial reſidence by the
" choice of Julian, or the ſucceſs of Maximus,
" few were able to preſerve their innocence or
" reputation. The liberal gifts of money,
" lands, and houſes, were inſufficient to ſati-
" ate their rapacious avarice; and the indig-

nation

"nation of the people was juſtly excited by "the remembrance of their abject poverty, "and diſintereſted profeſſions."

Julian indulged his vanity in a work which he compoſed, entitled *the Cæſars*, in which he ſatyrized all the emperors who had gone before him. He alſo wrote ſeveral books againſt the chriſtian religion; but in them there appeared to be more of wit than of argument*.

Of all the preceding emperors Julian was the greateſt admirer of Marcus Antoninus; and as he reſembled him in ſome of his good qualities, though not in all of them, ſo he certainly partook of his ſuperſtition. That he had this, and other faults, is acknowledged by his beſt friends. To copy the account which Dr. Lardner, whoſe impartiality has never been called in queſtion, gives of him, "he had a certain levity of mind, he was a "great talker, and very fond of fame, ſuper-"ſtitious rather than properly religious, ſo "addicted to ſacrificing, that it was ſaid the "race of bulls would be deſtroyed if he re-"turned victorious from Perſia; and ſuch was "the multitude of his victims, that his ſoldi-"ers who partook of them were often much "diſordered by exceſs in eating and drinking.

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. iii. Cap. 1. p. 167. &c.

"So

" So Ammianus. It would be tedious to re-
" hearſe all the inſtances of exceſſive, and even
" ridiculous ſuperſtition, which may be
" found in heathen writers.

" Libanius ſays he received the riſing ſun
" with blood, and attended him again with
" blood at his ſetting; and becauſe he could
" not go abroad ſo often as he would, he
" made a temple of his palace, and placed
" altars in his garden, which was purer than
" moſt chapels. By frequent devotions he
" engaged the gods to be his auxilaries in
" war, worſhipping Mercury, Ceres, Mars,
" Calliope, Apollo, and Jupiter, whom he
" worſhipped in his temple upon the hill,
" and in the city, meaning Antioch. Com-
" plaining of the gods who had deſerted
" him, Whom ſhall we blame, ſays Libanius,
" not one, but all; for none were neglected
" by him, neither gods nor goddeſſes. And
" is this the return, ſays he, for all his vic-
" tims, for all his vows, for all the incenſe,
" and all the blood offered up to them, by day
" and by night. Again, ſays the ſame writer,
" wherever there was a temple, whether in
" the city or on the hill, or on the tops of the
" mountains, no place was ſo rough, or ſo
" difficult of acceſs, but he ran to it as if the

" way

"way had been ſmooth and pleaſant, if it had "a temple, or ever had had one.

"But though Julian was ſo devout and re- "ligious in his way, when he was diſap- "pointed, he could be diſpleaſed, and even "angry with his gods, like other heathen peo- "ple, eſpecially the vulgar among them. In "the Perſian war, having had ſome advan- "tages, and expecting more, he prepared a "grand ſacrifice for Mars; but the omens "not being favourable, he was exceeding- "ly moved, and called Jupiter to witneſs, "that he would never more offer a ſacrifice "to Mars. This exceſs of ſuperſtition, it "ſeems to me, is an argument of want of "judgment, which defect appeared upon di- "vers occaſions, and in many actions not al- "together becoming the dignity of an em- "peror*."

Julian was heard to declare that if he could render each individual richer than Midas, and every city greater than Babylon, he ſhould not eſteem himſelf the benefactor of mankind, unleſs at the ſame time, he could reclaim his ſubjects from their impious revolt againſt the immortal gods†.

* Teſtimonies, Vol. iv. p. 25.

† Gibbon's Hiſt. Vol. ii. p. 379.

SECTION III.

Inſtances of Julian's Partiality for the Heathens, and his Prejudice againſt the Chriſtians.

NOTWITHSTANDING the profeſſed moderation of Julian, the difference of his behaviour towards the heathens and chriſtians, in ſimilar circumſtances, was ſufficiently ſtriking, as will appear from the following examples.

There was in the city of Alexandria a place in which the heathen prieſts had been uſed to offer human ſacrifices. This place, as being of no uſe, Conſtantius gave to the church of Alexandria, and George the biſhop gave orders for it to be cleared, in order to build a chriſtian church on the ſpot. In doing this they diſcovered an immenſe ſubterraneous cavern, in which the heathen myſteries had been performed, and in it were many human ſculls. Theſe, and other things, which they found in the place, the chriſtians brought out, and expoſed to public ridicule. The heathens, provoked at this exhibition, ſuddenly took arms, and ruſhing upon the chriſtians,

tians, killed many of them with ſwords, clubs, and ſtones: ſome alſo they ſtrangled, and ſeveral they crucified.

On this the chriſtians proceeded no farther in clearing the temple; but the heathens, purſuing their advantage, ſeized the biſhop as he was in the church, and put him in priſon. The next day they diſpatched him, and then faſtening the body to a camel, he was dragged about the ſtreets all day, and in the evening they burnt him and the camel together. This fate, Sozomen ſays, the biſhop owed in part to his haughtineſs while he was in favour with Conſtantius, and ſome ſay the friends of Athanaſius were concerned in this maſſacre; but he aſcribes it chiefly to the inveteracy of the heathens, whoſe ſuperſtitions he had been very active in aboliſhing. Had any chriſtians been concerned in it, he juſtly obſerves that Julian would have triumphed in the circumſtance, and not have reproached the pagans with it as he did.

When the emperor was informed of theſe ſhocking outrages and cruelties, he neither ordered any enquiry to be made after the authors of them, nor expreſſed a wiſh to puniſh any perſon whatever; but contented himſelf with writing them a letter of reproof, acknowledg-

ing that the chriſtians had deſerved all that they had ſuffered, and even more; but aſking them if they were not aſhamed to tear a man in pieces like ſo many dogs, and then lift up their hands in prayer to the Gods, as if they were pure. They ought, he ſays, to have had recourſe to the laws when they thought themſelves injured, and that they were happy in having an emperor who would apply no other remedy to their diſorders beſides reproof and exhortation, which he hoped they would reſpect the more, as they were Greeks. He then ſays that he forgave them for the ſake of their God Serapis, Alexander the founder of their city, and his uncle Julian, who was præfect of Egypt and Alexandria, extremely addicted to the heathen ſuperſtition, and a promoter of the perſecution of the chriſtians, beyond the orders of his maſter*.

This George the Arian biſhop of Alexandria, was a man of letters, and had a very valuable library, which Julian ordered to be ſeized for his own uſe; and in his orders concerning it, he ſays that many of the books were on philoſophical and rhetorical ſubjects, though many of them related to the doctrine

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. iii. Cap. 23. p. 173. Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. v. Cap. 7. p. 189.

of

of the *impious Galileans* (as in his ſneering contemptuous way he always affected to call the chriſtians) "These books," ſays he, "I could "wiſh to have utterly deſtroyed; but leſt books "of value ſhould be deſtroyed along with "them, let theſe alſo be carefully ſought for." He ſays that he himſelf was not unacquainted with the books of this biſhop, for that when he was in Cappadocia he had borrowed ſome of them, to have them tranſcribed, and then returned them again. On this occaſion Lardner juſtly obſerves, that it was a mean thing in this emperor, and below a philoſopher, to wiſh that chriſtian writings ſhould be deſtroyed *. I would add, that it does not appear that any price was to be given for theſe books to the family of the proprietor of them.

Such was the forbearance of Julian towards the heathens. Let us now ſee on what ſlight pretences he baniſhed ſome chriſtian biſhops, as Athanaſius of Alexandria, Eleuſius of Cyzicum, and Titus of Boſtra, all men of great diſtinction, as Lardner obſerves, whoſe extracts from Sozomen on this ſubject I ſhall quote, or abridge.

* Teſtimonies, Vol. iv. p. 98.

"Julian, hearing that Athanaſius, who "had ſucceeded to the church of Alexan- "dria after the death of George above-men- "tioned, boldly taught the people, and "brought over many Gentiles to chriſtianity, "ordered him to leave the place, and "threatened him with a ſevere penalty if he "did not*. Though the emperor, ſays this "writer, was determined by all means to re- "ſtore heatheniſm, he judged it imprudent "to compel men by puniſhments to ſacrifice "againſt their will. Nevertheleſs he baniſh-

* *Ecditius* the præfect of Egypt, delaying to carry his orders into execution, Julian wrote to him as follows: "Though you neglect to write to me on any "other ſubject, at leaſt it is your duty to inform me "of your conduct towards Athanaſius, the enemy of "the Gods. My intentions have been long ſince com- "municated to you. I ſwear by the great Serapis, "that unleſs, on the calends of December, Athanaſius "has departed from Alexandria, nay, from Egypt, the "officers of your government ſhall pay a fine of one "hundred pounds of gold. You know my temper. "I am ſlow to condemn, but ſtill ſlower to forgive." This epiſtle was enforced by a ſhort poſtſcript, written with the emperor's own hand. "The contempt "that is ſhewn for all the gods fills me with grief and "indignation. There is nothing that I ſhould ſee, "nothing that I ſhould hear, with more pleaſure, than "the expulſion of Athanaſius from all Egypt. The "abominable wretch. Under my reign, the baptiſm "of ſeveral Grecian Ladies, of the higheſt rank, has "been the effect of his perſecutions." Gibbon's Hiſtory, Vol. ii. p. 408.

"ed

"ed the clergy out of cities, intending by "their abſence to aboliſh the aſſemblies of the "people, when there were none to teach them "and perform the accuſtomed rites, that in "length of time the memory of their wor-"ſhip might be loſt. His pretence for ſo "doing was that the clergy excited the peo-"ple to ſedition. Under this pretence he "baniſhed Eleuſius and his friends from "Cyzicum, though there was no ſedition "there, nor any reaſon to apprehend it.

"He alſo required that the people of Boſ-"tra ſhould, by a public decree, expel from "their city their biſhop Titus; becauſe when "he had threatened that if there was any diſ-"turbance in that place he ſhould impute it "to the biſhop and his clergy, Titus had ſent "a letter to the emperor, aſſuring him that the "chriſtians in Boſtra were equal in number to "the Gentiles, that they were very peaceable, "and that paying a regard to his admoni-"tions, they had no thought of making any "diſturbance. From theſe words Julian "took occaſion to write a letter to the peo-"ple of Boſtra, in order to incenſe them "againſt Titus, as having accuſed them, by "intimating that it was not owing to their "good temper, but to his exhortations, that

" they were kept from ſedition, though the " letter was very far from admitting any ſuch " conſtruction. On this pretence, however, " he excited the people to expel the biſhop, " as a public enemy.

" The like happened in many other places, " partly owing to the command of the empe- " ror, and partly to the violence and petu- " lence of the people; but the whole fault, " ſays the hiſtorian, is to be aſcribed to the " emperor himſelf, who neglected to puniſh " according to the laws thoſe who, out of " hatred to our religion, tranſgreſſed in theſe " reſpects, ſeemingly reproving them in " words, but by actions really exciting them " to ſuch irregularities*."

* Lardner's Teſtimonies, Vol. iv. p. 109.

SECT.

SECTION IV.

Julian's Artifices to ſubvert Chriſtianity, and his Teſtimony in favour of it.

THE whole of Julian's conduct clearly ſhews that, in his reſtoration of the biſhops to the ſees from which they had been expelled, which had the appearance of juſtice and moderation, his real deſign was to promote diſſenſions in the churches, by the conteſts which would neceſſarily ariſe between the biſhops who were recalled, and thoſe who had obtained poſſeſſion of their ſees, to prevent which he had made no proviſion whatever. In conſequence of this order, however, Meletius returned to Antioch*, Athanaſius to Alexandria, Hilary to Gaul, Lucifer to Sardinia, both from Thebais, and Euſebius to Italy. But the conſequence of this was, what no doubt Julian rejoiced in, great

* Conſtantius being diſpleaſed with Meletius, becauſe, contrary to his expectations, he found him to be an advocate for the Homoouſian doctrine, ſent him to Meletina his native place, and put Euzoius into his ſee. Philoſtorgii Hiſt. Lib. v. Cap. 5. p. 509.

diſſenſions

diſſenſions in the churches to which they returned, eſpecially at Antioch, where the different factions did not ceaſe of eighty years. Among others he reſtored Aetius, writing him a very friendly letter, inviting him to come to him, and defraying the expences of his journey. He not only favoured the Novatians, but obliged Eleuſius biſhop of Cyzicum to rebuild at his own expence, and within the ſhort ſpace of two months, a church of that ſect which he had been the means of deſtroying in the time of Conſtantius. This was juſtice, no doubt, but adminiſtered in a capricious manner, and not with a view to anſwer the proper ends of juſtice, which is to promote the peace of ſociety *.

Julian alſo gave leave to the Donatiſts to hold their aſſemblies as uſual; and having been grievouſly oppreſſed by the Catholics, they are ſaid by Optatus †, to have taken ample revenge for their paſt injuries; but the violences which he deſcribes as committed by them on this occaſion can hardly be credited.

Among other methods which Julian took to eſtabliſh heatheniſm he endeavoured to

* Theod. Hiſt. Lib. iii. Cap. 4, 5. p. 125, &c. Sozmeni Hiſt. Lib. v. Cap. 5. p. 187.

† Lib. vi. p. 111, &c.

make

make the heathens adopt thoſe cuſtoms to which he thought the great credit and flouriſhing ſtate of chriſtians, were chiefly owing. But nothing of the kind having ever been attempted before, his ſcheme was unnatural and ineffectual. With this view, however, he ordered that the heathen temples ſhould be furniſhed, like the chriſtian churches, with ſeats for perſons of different claſſes; and he appointed readers and preachers, to give regular lectures on certain days and hours. He alſo provided places of retreat, like monaſteries, for thoſe who choſe to ſpend their lives in philoſophical ſpeculation, and other places for the reception of poor people and ſtrangers; and he eſtabliſhed rules of penance for offences voluntary and involuntary. But what he particularly admired among the chriſtians were the tickets which they gave to thoſe who travelled, to inſure them a friendly reception wherever they went.

A letter which he wrote to Arſacius, high prieſt of Galatia, ſhews both his ſolicitude upon this ſubject, and how hopeleſs his project was. I ſhall therefore give a conſiderable part of it, ſometimes uſing the tranſlation of Dr. Lardner.

"If

" If Helleniſm does not proſper according " to our wiſh, it is the fault of thoſe who " profeſs it. With reſpect to the religion " itſelf, there is nothing wanting in point of " excellence or magnificence, and ſo great a " change has taken place in favour of it as " far exceeds our utmoſt expectations. But " this will not ſuffice without attending to " the circumſtances which have contributed " to the increaſe of Atheiſm" (meaning chriſtianity) " ſuch as their humanity to ſtrangers, " the care they take about burying their dead, " and their affected gravity of manners, each " of which we ought to adopt. Nor is it " enough that you alone act in this manner, " but all the inferior prieſts in Galatia, whom " you muſt, by ſhame, or perſuaſion, bring " into this method, or remove them from the " ſacerdotal office. Their wives, children, " and ſervants, muſt come to the worſhip of " the gods, and muſt forbear to converſe with " the ſervants, children, and wives of the " Galileans, who are impious towards the " gods, and prefer impiety to religion. You " are likewiſe to order them not to frequent " the theatre, nor to drink in taverns, nor to " exerciſe any mean and ſordid employments.

" Such

" Such as hearken to your directions you are " to encourage, others you are to reject.

" You muſt alſo erect hoſpitals in every " city, that ſtrangers alſo may ſhare in our " humanity. As to the expence, I have al- " ready provided for it; having ordered thirty " thouſand (modii) pecks of wheat, and ſixty " thouſand (ξεσαι) pints of wine to be given " every year for the whole province of Ga- " latia, a fifth part of which I would have " given to thoſe poor perſons who attend " upon the prieſts, and the reſt to ſtrangers " and beggars. For it is a ſhame that when " there are no beggars among the Jews, and " the impious Galileans relieve not only " their own people, but ours alſo, our poor " ſhould be neglected by us, and be left help- " leſs and deſtitute. Teach the Gentiles, " therefore, that they contribute ſomething " to this ſervice, and that the villagers offer " their firſt fruits to the gods; and ſhew them " that this has been an ancient cuſtom among " the Greeks, as we may ſee in Homer.

" Very rarely viſit the civil governors at " their houſes, but rather write to them. " When they enter a city, let no prieſt go out " to meet them. When they enter the tem- " ples of the gods, let no prieſt go farther than

" the

" the veſtibule to wait upon them. When
" they enter the temples, let none of their
" guards go before them, but let them follow
" if they pleaſe: for as ſoon as any perſon
" paſſes the threſhold of the temple, he is to
" be conſidered as no other than a private per-
" ſon. You know very well that within the
" temple you yourſelf hold the higheſt rank,
" as the divine law requires. They who ſub-
" mit to this regulation, are indeed pious wor-
" ſhippers of the gods, but they who carry
" their pride and pomp along with them are
" vain-glorious perſons.

" I am very willing to relieve the people of
" Peſſinum if they will firſt appeaſe the mo-
" ther of the gods; but if they neglect her
" they will not only be reproved, but, what
" I am ſorry to add, ſhall feel my indignation,
" for" quoting two Greek verſes, " we muſt
" have no compaſſion upon, or ſhew any
" favour to thoſe who are the enemies of
" the immortal gods. Aſſure them, there-
" fore, that if they expect any favour from
" me, they muſt all worſhip the mother of
" the gods*."

In this letter it is eaſy to perceive the ſpirit of a perſecutor, and that Julian would have

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. v. Cap. 16. p. 203.

done

done as much as Diocletian and his colleagues, if he could have attempted it with ſafety to himſelf, and with any proſpect of ſucceſs. But it is more pleaſing to obſerve in it the traces of ſome excellent chriſtian cuſtoms of this age, ſuch as the gravity and decency of their manners, eſpecially thoſe of the clergy, who paid no ſervile court to the civil governors, their care to avoid the threatre and the taverns; their charity, which was not confined to themſelves, but extended even to the heathens, their reverence for their religion, and for their places of public worſhip, ſo that a magiſtrate was conſidered as no other than a private perſon when he was there.

How ſtrange muſt all this exhortation to moral duties have appeared to the prieſts and profeſſors of heatheniſm, whoſe religion never had, or could poſſibly have, any connexion, with moral virtue, and the chief recommendation of which to the common people were the riotous and licentious feſtivals which it provided for them, and the promiſes it held out to them of enabling them to pry into futurity. As to moral inſtruction the duties of mutual affection, and extenſive charity, the attempt to graft them upon heatheniſm (in

which the doctrine of one God, of his moral government, and a future ſtate of retribution was unknown) muſt have appeared ridiculous to the heathens themſelves.

If the things which Julian recommends in this letter (and of which he himſelf would have had no idea, if he had not ſeen them among chriſtians) if they had had any natural connexion with heatheniſm, it would have appeared long before, even before the appearance of chriſtianity. On the contrary, the religious rites of the Greeks and Romans had ſuch an evident tendency to debaſe the minds, and to corrupt the morals of men, that about the time of our Saviour the philoſophers began to be aſhamed of them: and the zeal that we afterwards find for them in ſuch men as Marcus Antoninus, Julian, and the heathen philoſophers of his age, aroſe from their having nothing elſe to oppoſe to chriſtianity, and to prevent its ſpreading among the common people. With reſpect to theſe, Julian did not take the right method to gain them. Some new and more diverting ſpectacle, ſome refinement in ſenſual gratification, or ſome improvement in the art of divination, might have been attended to; but moral lectures,

tures, of piety, and virtue, had no charms for them; otherwiſe, they would have become chriſtians.

Julian was very ſenſible that an open perſecution of chriſtians, if he could have undertaken it with ſafety to himſelf (which in his ſituation, and eſpecially at the beginning of his reign, he certainly could not) would have been ineffectual. But it is evident from his whole conduct, that there was nothing nearer his heart than to undermine chriſtianity by degrees, and to extirpate it altogether if poſſible. This ſcheme, and his preparation for the Perſian war, occupied him intirely. Far, indeed, was Julian from being the philoſopher that he firſt affected to be, in leaving religion free to all his ſubjects, without preferring, or moleſting, any perſon on that account. If ever there was a bigot to the rites of heatheniſm, and a malignant one with reſpect to chriſtianity, it was Julian, who appears in ſo reſpectable a light to many modern unbelievers.

SECTION V.

Julian's more direct Attempts to undermine, and gradually to extirpate, Chriſtianity.

JULIAN, as has been ſeen already, was continually ſacrificing, and encouraging others to do it. He took from the chriſtian clergy and their churches, all the privileges and grants of his predeceſſors. He reſtored to the heathen prieſts, of every claſs, their former honours and immunities; enforcing, however, that ſuperſtitious abſtinence from certain meats, which had been preſcribed to ſome of the claſſes of them; and he gave back to the temples their former revenues. The Nilometer, which, by order of Conſtantine, had been kept in a chriſtian church, he removed to the temple of Serapis.

He was frequently writing to the cities which were moſt addicted to the heathen rites, encouraging them to aſk any favours of him, and ſhewing the greateſt readineſs to grant them. But he had ſuch an averſion to thoſe cities in which chriſtianity was generally

generally profeſſed, that he would not ſo much as hear their complaints. Though the people of Niſibis were particularly expoſed to the irruptions of the Perſians, on the approach of the war, he would not receive their ambaſſadors, and ſaid he ſhould ſend them no ſuccours, becauſe they were all chriſtians. He conſidered their city as a polluted place, and ſaid that he ſhould never ſet his foot in it, unleſs they returned to the heathen religion.

Such was this truly philoſophical emperor, the common father of all his ſubjects. Julian had the ſame objection to the people of Conſtantia, becauſe they were all chriſtians, and annexed the place to the city of Gaza, to which it was a ſea port, though Conſtantine had given it the privileges of an independent city; and there was no reaſon for the change in favour of Gaza, but that the inhabitants of this place were generally heathens*.

He likewiſe ſtruck Cæſarea, the metropolis of Cappadocia, out of the liſt of cities, and changed its name, becauſe almoſt all the inhabitants were chriſtians, and had demoliſhed the temples of Jupiter and Apollo. Hearing that they had proceeded to demoliſh the only

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. v. Cap. 2. p. 182.

temple that remained in the place after his acceſſion to the empire, he was provoked to the higheſt degree, and reproached the heathen inhabitants, though they were very few in number, for not exerting themſelves to prevent it.

Julian ordered the ſtricteſt inquiry to be made into all eſtates belonging to chriſtian churches, in order to confiſcate the whole of them, and he did not ſcruple to make uſe of torture to come at the truth, which was a moſt cruel perſecution under another name. He ſubjected all the chriſtian clergy to the loweſt ſervices in the army, and he made the common people in the cities to pay the ſame tax that was exacted in the villages. He threatened that unleſs the chriſtians rebuilt the temples he would never ceaſe till he had deſtroyed the places in which they had ſtood, and uſed to add, that he would not even ſuffer the Galileans to wear their heads. Our hiſtorian juſtly obſerves, that if it had been in his power, and he had not been prevented by death, he would probably have been as good as his word *.

Though Julian forbore to perſecute unto death, he could not, on ſeveral occaſions, re-

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. v. Cap. 4. p. 184.

frain

ſtrain from uſing inſults, which ſufficiently ſhewed what he *felt*, and what he wiſhed to do. When he was ſacrificing in a temple at Conſtantinople, and Maris the biſhop of Chalcedon, a man reſpectable for his learning, and the part that he had acted in public life, and now for his age, was coming that way, he abuſed him as an impious perſon, and an enemy of the gods. He had even the meanneſs to reproach him for his blindneſs, ſaying, "Will not your Galilean God cure you." The old man replied, "I thank my God that "I am deprived of ſight, that I may not ſee "your fall from piety." On this occaſion the emperor had ſo much command of himſelf, as to paſs on without making any anſwer*.

Notwithſtanding Julian's affectation of great magnanimity, he was not always ſo much maſter of himſelf as he appeared to be on this occaſion, which indeed was at the beginning of his reign. When he was at Antioch, a little before he ſet out on his expedition againſt Perſia, two of the officers who attended upon his perſon, Juventinus and Maximus, complained that, by his orders, every thing in the city was polluted with the

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. v. Cap. 4. p. 185.

rites of heatheniſm, ſo that the very fountains which ſupplied the city, and every thing that was ſold in the market, bread, fleſh meat, herbs, apples, &c. had been ſprinkled with luſtral water, by which it was, as it were, conſecrated to the heathen gods: for ſuch had been his inſidious policy, in order to draw the people inſenſibly into idolatry.

Julian hearing of their having made theſe complaints, ordered them to be brought before him; and as, by his manner of interrogating them (in which, as his cuſtom was, he affected great familiarity) he encouraged them to ſpeak freely, they told him that they *had* made thoſe complaints; and that having been educated in the chriſtian religion, under his predeceſſors Conſtantine and Conſtantius, they could not help being diſguſted at ſeeing every thing contaminated with the rites of heatheniſm; but that this was the only thing of which they complained in his reign. At this he was ſo provoked, that he ordered them to be put to death with torture, pretending that it was not on account of their religion, but for their petulence in inſulting their emperor. However, the chriſtian citizens of Antioch juſtly conſidered them as martyrs,

martyrs, providing for them a ſplendid monument, and obſerving an annual feſtival for them *.

About the ſame time a deaconneſs, of the name of Pythia, a leader of a choir of women, having ſung pſalms as the emperor was paſſing by the doors of a church, and having, imprudently perhaps, made choice of thoſe pſalms in which the heathen gods and their worſhippers are ſpoken of with contempt, he was ſo provoked, that he ſent for her; and though ſhe was very old, one of his guards ſtruck her by his orders on both the cheeks, in his preſence, till the blood came out †.

When Valentinian, who was afterwards emperor, but then only a tribune, was walking before Julian into a heathen temple, in the early part of his reign, he ſtruck the prieſt, who either caſually, or as he probably thought, intentionally, ſprinkled him, as well as the emperor, with the luſtral water, as thinking himſelf defiled by it. But the emperor was ſo offended at the liberty which he took, that he baniſhed him to a caſtle ſituated in a deſert place ‡.

* Theod. Hiſt. Lib. iii. Cap. 15. p. 134.
† Ibid. Cap. 19. p. 138.
‡ Ibid. Cap. 16. p. 136.

Julian withdrew from the churches that allowance from the public funds which Conſtantine had granted for the relief of the poor and the widows. He moreover took from the churches all their ſacred veſſels, and other things of value that had been preſented to them, and wherever the temples had been deſtroyed, he compelled the chriſtians to rebuild them; and when they were unable to do this, he puniſhed them with impriſonment and torture, without excepting the biſhops and clergy; ſo that, in this form, our hiſtorian ſays, the perſecution was in reality not much leſs grievous than it had been under the heathen emperors *.

Julian was more particularly intent on baniſhing all chriſtians from the army. For this purpoſe he removed the ſign of the croſs from the ſtandards, and in the ſtatues which were made for him he gave orders that a figure of ſome of the heathen gods ſhould accompany them. For example, Jupiter was drawn as deſcending from heaven, and preſenting him with his crown and purple robe, the enſigns of imperial power, or Mars or Mercury, ſmiling upon him, the former as a warrior, and the latter as an orator. This

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. v. Cap. 5. p. 186.

he

he did that thoſe who paid homage to his ſtatues might at the ſame time be obliged to pay their reſpects to thoſe heathen gods. If they refuſed to do it, he puniſhed their neglect, as an offence againſt himſelf.

In order to deceive the ſoldiers into the act of ſacrificing, he refuſed to give them the uſual donative on feſtival days, unleſs, according to the ancient cuſtom of the Romans, they threw ſome frankincenſe into the fire. This ſome of them incautiouſly did; but others who were apprized of the nature of the action, refuſed the donative on thoſe terms; and informing the others that they had been guilty of an act of idolatry, they were ſo much ſhocked at what they had done, that they ran about the ſtreets, declaring that they were chriſtians, and always had been ſo. They even went to the emperor, and returned the donative, telling him that they were ready to die for Chriſt if he ordered it. But he contented himſelf with diſmiſſing them from the ſervice *.

At one time, however, the clamour of ſome of theſe penitent ſoldiers to be led to martyrdom, rather than be thus betrayed into idolatry, provoked the emperor ſo much, that

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. v. Cap. 17. p. 205.

he

he ordered them to be beheaded. Accordingly, they were conducted to a place without the city, to which they were followed by a great croud of people, admiring and praiſing their fortitude, as had always been uſual on thoſe occaſions. Being arrived at the place of puniſhment, the oldeſt among them deſired the executioner to begin with the youngeſt, leſt he ſhould be terrified at ſeeing others put to death before him. Accordingly the youngeſt of them was placed on his knees, and the executioner was preparing to do his office, when the emperor ſent to recal his order. But the young man was ſo far from rejoicing at his deliverance, that he ſaid, "Romanus," for ſuch was his name, "was "not worthy to be a martyr." This lenity of Julian, the hiſtorian obſerves, was not ſpontaneous; but he envied the chriſtians the glory of their martyrs. However his baniſhing many of them from the cities into the extreme parts of the empire would, in many caſes, he adds, be a puniſhment worſe than death *.

Farther to diſcourage the profeſſion of chriſtianity, he took from thoſe who refuſed to ſacrifice the rights of citizens. He even

* Theod. Hiſt. Lib. iii. Cap. 17. p. 136.

forbade

forbade them all acceſs to the public Forum, and other places of general concourſe, and excluded them from all magiſtracies and honours, eſpecially from the government of provinces; alleging, in his inſulting manner (which is certainly no indication of a great mind, and which ſhews how little he was acquainted with chriſtianity, or how willing he was to pervert it) that their religion forbade the uſe of the ſword for the purpoſe of capital puniſhment *.

But the moſt illiberal of all the methods that Julian took to lower the credit, and prevent the ſpread of chriſtianity, a meaſure exclaimed againſt by the heathens themſelves, was that he would not allow the chriſtians to teach the Greek poets and orators. He was exceedingly mortified to obſerve how many chriſtians there were, both catholics and Arians, who diſtinguiſhed themſelves as men of letters; that Apollinaris the Syrian was ſo eminent in every kind of ſcience, and particularly that Baſil and Gregory of Cappadocia, who had ſtudied along with him at Athens, ſhould excel all the orators of their age; and thinking that they derived their great power of perſuaſion from their ſtudy of the

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. iii. Cap. 13. p. 188.

Greek orators, he wiſhed to deprive them of that advantage. As a reaſon for his conduct, he charged the chriſtians with inconſiſtency in teaching what they did not believe, and that it was abſurd in them to give leſſons out of Homer, Heſiod, Demoſthenes, Herodotus, Thucydides, Iſocrates, and Lyſias, and at the ſame time revile the gods whom thoſe writers had worſhipped. "If "they think thoſe books contain a falſe reli-"gion, let them go," ſays he, "to the churches "to the Galileans, and there ſtudy Matthew "and Luke*." But if Julian had thought that there had been that neceſſary connexion between the *religion* of the claſſic writers, and the excellence of their *ſtyle*, it would have been wiſer in him to have encouraged the chriſtians in the uſe of them, as a means of drawing them to the heathen religion. In him it was a low and unworthy inſult.

This prohibition, from which Julian expected ſo much, was far from anſwering his purpoſe. Oroſius ſays, that when he publiſhed his edict forbidding the chriſtian profeſſors of rhetoric to teach the liberal arts, they almoſt all choſe to reſign their chairs; and Jerom ſays that Proæreſius, the Athe-

* Juliani Epiſt. xlii. Opera. Vol. I. p. 422.

nian

nian ſophiſt, ſhut up his ſchool, though the emperor had granted him a ſpecial licence to teach. Auſtin records the like ſteadineſs of Victorinus, who had long taught rhetoric with great applauſe at Rome. But Ecebolius, a chriſtian ſophiſt at Conſtantinople, who had been Julian's maſter in rhetoric, was overcome by the temptations of the times, and openly profeſſed heatheniſm. However, when Julian was dead, he recovered himſelf, and with much humility, intreated to be reconciled to the church*.

In ſome meaſure to remedy the diſadvantage ariſing from their not having acceſs to the Grecian poets and orators, learned chriſtians, applied themſelves to write ſuch books as might in part ſupply the want of thoſe which had been uſually read in the ſchools. Particularly, Apollinaris the elder wrote in heroic verſe the hiſtory of the bible, as far as the reign of Saul, divided, like the Iliad, into twenty four books. He wrote comedies like thoſe of Menander, tragedies like thoſe of Euripides, and lyric poems like thoſe of Pindar, and alſo works of every other kind, not inferior, in the opinion of chriſtians of that age, to thoſe of the Grecian maſters.

* Lardner's Teſtimonies, Vol. iv. p. 41.

He

He likewiſe wrote an excellent work concerning *Truth*, againſt the heathen philoſophers, in which he ſhewed, by other arguments than thoſe which are drawn from the ſcriptures, that they were miſtaken in what they taught concerning God *.

The younger Apollinaris wrote the hiſtory of Chriſt, and of the apoſtles in the form of dialogues, like thoſe of Plato; and about this time alſo Heliodorus compoſed an elegant and ingenious romance called *Ethiopics*, which has ſerved as a model for other works of the kind. As ſoon, however, as, upon the death of Julian, chriſtians were at liberty to teach what books they pleaſed, all theſe compoſitions of chriſtianity were laid aſide, and the ſtudy of the Greek claſſics was reſumed, notwithſtanding the earneſt remonſtrances of ſome pious chriſtians againſt the practice †.

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. v. Cap. 18. p. 207.

† Socratis Hiſt. Lib. iii. Cap. 16. p. 191.

SEC-

SECTION VI.

Violences committed upon Chriſtians, in the Reign of Julian.

THAT Julian had as great a hatred of chriſtianity as any of the perſecuting emperors, and that he would have uſed any means that he could have thought would be effectual to extirpate it, cannot be doubted; and there were perſons enow to ſecond his views, and even go beyond his orders, indulging that brutal ſpirit with which the heathens in general, and eſpecially thoſe of the lower claſſes, were always actuated againſt the chriſtians. Indeed, notwithſtanding the boaſted lenity of Julian, there were many who were properly martyrs to their religion in his reign. Theodoret ſays that an account of the outrages committed by heathens upon the chriſtians, while Julian was emperor would require a ſeparate volume, and that he therefore confines himſelf to a few of the caſes.

At Aſcalon and Gaza, the heathen populace, without any orders from the emperor, but hoping to eſcape unpuniſhed for doing what

what they conceived would not be diſagreeable to him, indulged their brutal diſpoſition ſo far as to put to death ſeveral prieſts and nuns. It is even ſaid that they ripped open their bellies, and throwing barley upon the bowels, expoſed them to be torn by hogs.

The ſame ſhocking outrage was committed by the inhabitants of Heliopolis near mount Libanus, upon ſome nuns of that place, after expoſing them naked in the public ſtreets, and ſubjecting them to all kinds of inſults. They were provoked to this particular kind of outrage, becauſe they had been prohibited from proſtituting their young women, according to their ancient cuſtom, in the precincts of the temple, before marriage; a rite of heatheniſm which is particularly deſcribed by Herodotus, as practiſed in his time at Babylon. For Conſtantius had demoliſhed the celebrated temple of Venus in that place, and building a chriſtian church there, had prohibited the former proſtitutions*.

At the ſame city of Helipolis there was one Cyril a deacon, who in the preceding reign had been particularly active in demoliſhing the temple. The heathens, not forgetting this, took advantage of the preſent times

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. v. Cap. 10. p. 194.

not

not only to kill the man, but it is ſaid that they even tore and taſted his liver. The hiſtory of former perſecutions, and the brutal diſpoſition of the lower claſs of idolaters, will make this part of the ſtory not incredible, though no regard is due to what is ſubjoined by the chriſtian writers, of the judgment of God upon theſe inhuman murderers, of their teeth falling out, and their tongues corrupting, &c. The fact of the murder being true, the ſuperſtition of the age would eaſily add the reſt.

At Doroſtolum, a city of Thrace, Æmilianus was burned alive, on what pretence is not ſaid, by the order of Capitolinus the præfect. At Arethuſa in Syria one Mark, who in the time of Conſtantius had ſhewn much zeal in deſtroying the heathen temples, and building chriſtian churches with their materials, was ſeized by the inhabitants of the place, after he had firſt fled, but afterwards ſurrendered himſelf; and though he was an old man, they firſt ſcourged him naked, then dragged him through the common ſhore, and anointing him with honey and ſome kind of pickle, ſuſpended him in the ſun, to be tormented with waſps and other inſects. This they did in order to extort from him

money to repair their temples. But finding that, though he was pricked with ſtiles, as well as tormented with inſects, he refuſed to give any thing for ſuch a purpoſe, they diſmiſſed him; and, admiring his conſtancy, many of them were afterwards converted to chriſtianity*.

At Merum in Phrygia the præfect Amalchius ordered a heathen temple to be cleared, and the image that was in it to be repaired; which gave ſuch offence to three zealous chriſtians, Macedonius, Theodulus, and Tatian, that they went in the night, and broke the image. When the governor was going to puniſh the innocent inhabitants of the place, they confeſſed what they had done, and refuſing to ſacrifice (on which their lives would have been ſpared) they were expoſed to all kinds of torture, and at length put upon a gridiron and roaſted before a ſlow fire; but even in this ſituation they made light of their torments†.

At the ſame time Buſiris of Ancyra in Galatia, who was of the ſect of the Encratites, having inſulted the heathens, was ſeized by

* Theod. Hiſt. Lib. iii. Cap. 7. p. 128. Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. v. Cap. 10. p. 194.

† Socratis Hiſt. Lib. iii. Cap. 15. p. 190. Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. v. Cap. 11. p. 196.

the

the governor of the province, and being placed upon the engine of torture, he held up his own hands, and expoſed his ſides to be torn; ſaying, there was no occaſion to faſten him, and, without changing his poſture, he bore all the pain they could put him to. He was then ſent to priſon; but being releaſed after the death of Julian, he lived to the reign of Theodoſius, and joined the catholic church.

At the ſame time Baſil, a preſbyter of the church of Ancyra, and Eupſychius of Cæſarea in Capadocia, ſuffered martyrdom, the latter being a man of an honourable family, and juſt married. They were among thoſe who had demoliſhed the heathen temple in that place, which gave ſuch extreme offence to Julian, that all who were concerned in it were puniſhed with death or baniſhment. Baſil had been particularly zealous in exhorting the people not to ſacrifice, but to adhere to their religion, without regarding any thing that they might be called to ſuffer. This he did at a time of public ſacrifice, and being ſeized by the preſident, he bore torture with great conſtancy before he expired. Theſe facts, as the hiſtorian juſtly obſerves, ſhew that there were many martyrs in this reign,

though no orders had been given to puniſh chriſtians, as ſuch, with death *.

At Gaza the heathen inhabitants who, as has been obſerved, were much more numerous than the chriſtians, ſeized upon Euſebius, Neſtabus, and Zeno, who in the preceding reign had demoliſhed their temples, and inſulted their religion; and having firſt ſcourged, and then impriſoned them, they afterwards dragged them along the pavement, with their faces ſometimes upwards and ſometimes downwards, beating them with ſtones, clubs, and other things. The women ran out of their houſes, and ſome poured boiling water upon them, and others thruſt ſpits, &c. into them; and when they had mangled them in this manner, they took them to a place without the city, where the carcaſſes of beaſts were uſually thrown, and burning them, mixed their bones with thoſe of camels and aſſes.

Zeno their couſin, having collected their bones, narrowly eſcaped being ſeized, and fled to Anthedon, a place on the ſea coaſt, about twenty ſtadia from Gaza. The heathen inhabitants of this place, diſcovering him, ſcourged him, and turned him out of the city. He then took refuge in Conſtantia, the in-

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. v. Cap 11. p. 196.

habitants

habitants of which, as has been obſerved, were chriſtians, and there he was concealed till the danger was over. In the reign of Theodoſius this Zeno became the biſhop of the place, and building a church without the city, he depoſited in it the remains of his couſins above mentioned, together with thoſe of Neſtor, another of them, who had been ſeized and ſcourged at the ſame time, and left for dead, and who afterwards died of his bruiſes in the houſe of Zeno.

For theſe ſhocking violences Julian did not even reprove the people of Gaza by a letter, as he had done the citizens of Alexandria. Nay he diſplaced the governor of the province, for having ſeized ſome of the perſons concerned in theſe outrages, in order to their trial; ſaying, there was no occaſion for that, when they had only revenged themſelves upon a few Galileans, for the many injuries they had done to them and their gods. Hilario a monk of Gaza eſcaped death by flying firſt to Sicily, then to Dalmatia, and laſtly to Cyprus *.

Laſtly, Julian himſelf not only confiſcated the property of Artemius, who had been the

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. v. Cap. 9, 10. p. 191, 193.

military commander in Egypt in the time of Conſtantius, and had been active in breaking the images, but ordered him to be beheaded. This, ſays Theodoret, was done by that prince, whoſe clemency and freedom from anger, his admirers ſo much extol*.

Julian's averſion to chriſtianity was ſo great, that, in oppoſition to it, he patronized the Jews, whoſe religion he no more reſpected than that of the chriſtians, but whoſe enmity to them was equal to his own. There is a letter of his ſtill extant inſcribed *to the community of the Jews*, in which he boaſts of his having aboliſhed ſome taxes which had been laid upon them, and calls their venerable patriarch his brother. He alſo intreats their prayers for him, that when he ſhall be returned victorious from the Perſian war, he may rebuild the holy city Jeruſalem, which for a long time they had earneſtly deſired to ſee inhabited; and that he might come and dwell there himſelf, and together with them offer up prayers to the ſupreme deity†.

It is alſo ſaid that Julian, having inquired of ſome Jews why they did not ſacrifice according to their law, they told him that this

* Theod. Hiſt. Lib. iii. Cap. 18. p. 137.
† Lardner's Teſtimonies, Vol. iv. p. 47.

could

could only be done at the temple of Jeruſalem, which was deſtroyed, and that on this account, as alſo with a view to defeat the predictions of our Saviour, he gave orders for rebuilding their temple at his own expence. With this encouragement it is alſo ſaid, that the Jews began the work, but that they were prevented by an earthquake, and various miracles, the particulars of which I ſhall not recite becauſe they are evidently fabulous*.

That Julian once intended to rebuild the temple at Jeruſalem is highly probable, from his well known hatred of chriſtianity, and the levity of his temper; but that he ſeriouſly entered upon a work of this magnitude, and that he actually contributed any thing towards the expence of it on the eve of a Perſian war, is not probable; and his death prevented whatever he might have intended to do after this. As to the Jews, encouraged as they were by the emperor, they would naturally think of the ſcheme, and would probably be laying ſome plan for carrying it into execution; but ſuch an undertaking required more time than

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. iii. Cap. 20. p. 196. Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. v. Cap. 22. p. 213. Theodoret. Lib. iii. Cap. 20. p. 139. See Lardner's Teſtimonies, Vol. iv. p. 46, &c.

the reign of Julian to do much more than confer about it.

SECTION VII.

Of Julian's Expedition againſt Perſia, and his Death.

IN December, A. D. 361, Julian arrived at Conſtantinople after the death of Conſtantius; there he ſtayed about eight months, and ſetting out for Antioch, in his way to Perſia, he arrived at that city in July, A. D. 362. In the beginning of March following he proceeded towards Perſia, but was ſlain in battle on the 6th of June. This is the general outline of the hiſtory of Julian after he became emperor. Let us now attend to ſome particulars of his progreſs towards the Eaſt.

Having collected a large ſum of money, chiefly by his exactions upon chriſtians, he entered upon his expedition; and when he came to Antioch, being apprehenſive that the price of proviſions would be advanced in conſequence of his preſence and that of his army, he

he very imprudently not only fixed the price of all the neceſſaries of life, but ſo low that the people of the neighbourhood did not think it worth their while to ſupply the market. What the people of Antioch ſuffered in conſequence of this, provoked them to make very free with their maſter; and as ſome of them were of a ſatyrical turn, they ridiculed him, and eſpecially his beard, ſaying it ought to be ſhorn, that ropes might be made of it, &c. He wore his beard, as chuſing to appear in the character of a philoſopher, as well as that of an emperor. And as, out of his great attachment to heatheniſm, he had ordered that upon his coins there ſhould be drawn an altar and a bull ready to be ſacrificed, they had ſaid that this bull would tear up the whole world.

At ſuch jokes as theſe the emperor was ſo irritated, that he threatened to leave the place, and go to Tarſus. But dropping this mode of revenge, and confiding in his own talent as a writer, he returned their jokes upon him, by others upon them, in a piece which he entitled *Miſopogon*; a thing certainly unworthy of the dignity of an emperor, eſpecially when engaged in ſo ſerious an expedition as

that

that againſt the Perſians always was to the Romans.

Julian, being arrived at Antioch, was much diſappointed, and chagrined, to find that the worſhip of Apollo at Daphne in the neighbourhood of that city, had been ſo much neglected. He called the great ſun to witneſs, that the condition in which he found the very image of god was ſuch as to ſhew that he had quitted the temple ſome time before. He had haſted to the place, he ſays, in expectation of ſeeing a moſt ſplendid worſhip, victims, libations, dances, &c. but on entering the temple he found neither incenſe, ſacred cake, nor victim. He ſtill thought that theſe things might be in ſome place out of the temple, and that they had waited for his coming, as for the high-prieſt. But when he enquired of the prieſt of the place what ſacrifices the city prepared for that great feſtival, he was anſwered that the city provided nothing of the kind, but that he himſelf had furniſhed a gooſe for the ſolemnity*. We may eaſily imagine what muſt have been the mortification of Julian to find the progreſs that chriſtians had now made in the extirpation of heatheniſm.

* Julian's Miſopogon, Opera. Vol. i. p. 361, &c.

Being

Being, however, near this famous temple at Daphne, Julian ſent to conſult the god about the ſucceſs of his expedition; but no anſwer being returned, and it being ſuppoſed that the body of Babylas the martyr (which had been buried in a place adjoining to the oracle) was the cauſe of this ſilence, he ordered it to be removed. This order the chriſtians readily obeyed; and marching in ſolemn proceſſion, with a great company of women and children, they conveyed the coffin into the town, ſinging pſalms all the way, and eſpecially thoſe in which the heathen gods and their worſhippers were inveighed againſt, as Pſ. xcvii. 7. *Confounded be all they that worſhip graven images, that boaſt themſelves of idols*, &c*.

The emperor highly provoked at this inſult, as he conſidered it, the next day ordered the leaders of this proceſſion to be arreſted, though Saluſt, the præfect of the Prætorian guards who was an heathen, endeavoured to perſuade him not to indulge the chriſtians with the honour of martyrdom. But ſeeing the emperor not able to reſtrain himſelf, he ordered a young man of the name of Theodorus, who had

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. iii. Cap. 18. p. 194. Theodoret Lib. iii. Cap. 10. p. 131.

ſhewn

ſhewn more zeal in the buſineſs than the reſt, to be ſeized; and placing him upon the engine of torture, he had his back and ſides torn from morning to evening, and then ordered him into ſtrict cuſtody. The next day Julian being informed of the fortitude of this youth, and how much the chriſtians in general gloried in it, ordered him to be diſmiſſed, and that no others ſhould be tortured.

Another thing which happened at the ſame time, and which, probably, mortified this heathen emperor ſtill more, was that the temple of Apollo, the god whoſe oracle he wiſhed to conſult, was conſumed by lightning, and the ſtatue of Apollo, which was made of wood covered with gold, was broken to pieces. Julian, the count of the Eaſt, and uncle of the emperor, hearing of this accident in the night, went immediately to Daphne, where the miſchief had happened; and ſeeing the temple in ruins, and the image reduced to aſhes, he tortured the guardians of the place, ſuſpecting that, with their connivance, it had been ſet on fire by ſome chriſtians; but no confeſſion of this kind could be extorted from them, as they perſiſted in ſaying that the fire came from above,

and

and ſome country people declared that they ſaw it deſcend from heaven *.

After this, as Julian made no ſcruple to confiſcate any property belonging to chriſtian churches, he ordered all the veſſels to be brought out of the large church which Conſtantine had built in Antioch; and locking the doors forbade any more aſſemblies to be held in it. Then, going into the church along with his uncle Julian, and two other attendants, Fœlix and Elpidius, who had abandoned chriſtianity to oblige their maſter, the Count is ſaid to have ſhewn his contempt of the place by making water upon the table at which the euchariſt was adminiſtered; and when Euzoius, the Arian biſhop of the church, would have prevented it, he gave him a blow on the head. And as, on this occaſion, Fœlix was admiring the richneſs and the curious workmanſhip of the veſſels, (for they had been provided by Conſtantine and Conſtantius at a great expence) the emperor ſaid, "See with what veſſels the ſon of "Mary is ſerved."

Not long after this Count Julian was ſeized with a loathſome diſeaſe (his bowels being obſtructed, and his excrements voided at his

* Theod. Hiſt. Lib. iii. Cap. 11. p. 131.

mouth)

mouth) which carried him off. Fœlix alſo died ſoon after, by bleeding at his mouth, and other parts of his body, and the chriſtians naturally enough ſaid, that the judgments of God had overtaken them for their profaneneſs and ſacrilege, as they did with reſpect to Julian himſelf afterwards *.

It was while Julian was at Antioch that what has been related concerning Juventinus and Maximus, Valentinian, and the other confeſſors among the ſoldiers, as alſo concerning Artemius, and Publia the deaconneſs happened, at all which the chagrin of Julian, with reſpect to chriſtianity, could not be concealed. This ill humour kept continually increaſing, and as he was always diſappointed, the mortifications he met with on this head muſt have rendered him very unhappy.

Before he proceeded on his expedition, beſides conſulting Apollo of Daphne, Julian ſent to conſult the oracles of Delos, Delphi, Dodona, and ſeveral others, all of which returned favourable anſwers, encouraging him with promiſes of victory. One of the anſwers, Theodoret ſays, was in theſe words: "All of us gods are now preparing to carry "the trophies of victory to the wild river,"

* Theod. Hiſt. Lib. iii. Cap. 12, 13. p. 132.

meaning

meaning the Tigris. "I, the warlike Mars, "will be their leader; and let those who call "Apollo the god of eloquence, and the pre- "sident of the muses, laugh at these verses if "they please. But I, having found out his "deceit, lament his fate who is deceived." I quote this oracle as a specimen of the folly and ambiguity of the heathen oracles in general, and to shew what kind of religion it was that this philosophical emperor preferred to christianity. The oracles collected by Herodotus, the oldest of the Greek historians, in whose time these things were in the highest credit, are no better than this. Julian, however, believing these oracles, promised himself certain victory, and threatened that, on his return, he would persecute the Galileans, and place the statue of Venus in their churches *.

When Julian was on his march a circumstance happened at Berea, which does him some credit, though Theodoret relates it with a different view. One of the officers who was about the emperor's person, and who was a christian, seeing his son go over to heathenism, had banished him from his house, and the young man had taken refuge with the

* Theod. Hist. Lib. iii. Cap. 21. p. 140.

emperor

emperor. He invited them both to dine with him; and placing them by each other at table, he very mildly told the father, that he ſhould not endeavour to force his ſon to become a chriſtian, ſince he himſelf did not compel any of them to adopt his religion. The officer replied, "you ſpeak of your "wicked and accurſed gods, who prefer "lies to the truth." But notwithſtanding this offenſive language, the emperor only adviſed him not to rail in that manner, and ſaid to the young man, "Since I cannot "perſuade your father to take care of you, "I will *."

It muſt be obſerved, however, that this good humour appeared at an entertainment, and upon an expedition in which it was greatly his intereſt to ſecure the good will of perſons of all deſcriptions; and notwithſtanding all his endeavours to get an army of heathens, he could not but know what appeared to be the fact immediately after his death, that a great part of that very army which he then commanded, and the ableſt of his officers, were chriſtians.

Julian had acquired the character of a good general in Gaul, but his conduct in this ex-

* Theod. Hiſt. Lib. ii. Cap. 22. p. 141.

pedition did not at all correſpond to this idea. It is acknowledged by all, that he committed many faults, and though he was ſufficiently apprized of them before hand, he perſiſted in following his own opinion, till he had no power either to advance or to recede; and after the army had ſuffered greatly, both from the enemy, and from famine, he received his death from an arrow.

The predictions which were afterwards pretended to have been delivered concerning the approaching death of Julian, I do not think neceſſary to relate, becauſe ſuch was the credulity of the times, that they would be believed on very ſlight evidence; but I cannot omit mentioning what Julian is ſaid to have done at Carrhæ a ſhort time before his death, the evidence of which Theodoret ſays was exiſting in his time, though I am far from ſaying that I think it intitled to credit.

Chuſing to march through Carrhæ, rather than Edeſſa, becauſe this place abounded with chriſtians, he entered into a temple, and after performing ſome ſecret rites, he ſhut and ſealed the door, leaving a guard of ſoldiers to ſee that it was not opened till his return. As he did not return, and a chriſtian emperor ſucceeded him, it is ſaid that the

temple was opened, and that the body of a woman, who had been ſacrificed for the ſake of inſpecting her liver, was found ſuſpended by the hair of her head, and her hands extended. It is alſo ſaid, but with ſtill leſs appearance of truth, that many heads of perſons who had been killed for ſimilar purpoſes were found at Antioch. Such, ſays our hiſtorian, are the rites of theſe abominable deities *.

Theſe ſtories I do not relate becauſe I think them deſerving of credit, but becauſe they are ſufficiently ſimilar to other facts which no perſon acquainted with heathen antiquity can deny; ſo that they give us a juſt idea of the true ſpirit and tendency of thoſe heathen ſuperſtitions, to which this emperor was addicted almoſt to infatuation. It cannot be denied that the entrails not only of animals, but alſo of men and women, have been thought proper ſubjects of inſpection in various rites of the heathen religion; a man having been thought a more valuable victim than a beaſt, and that the ſureſt prognoſtics were procured by their means.

By means of chriſtianity we in this country are happily removed from the actual ob-

* Theod. Hiſt. Lib. iii. Cap. 26. p. 143.

ſervance

ſervance of any thing of this kind, and are therefore more incredulous on the ſubject than we ſhould otherwiſe have been; but all hiſtory atteſts that there is no practice ſo abominable or ſo cruel, as not to have been authorized by the religion of Julian; and he endeavoured to reſtore it without any reſtriction, as it had been practiſed for ages before him. In this religion there were many ſecret rites, at which none but the *initiated* were preſent, and which they were under the moſt ſolemn obligation not to reveal. Theſe *myſteries*, as they were called, were not the ſublime doctrines of the unity of God, and the vanity of the popluar ſuperſtition, as Warburton paradoxically maintains, but in ſome caſes, ſuch things as it would have ſhocked the common people too much to have been acquainted with. It is impoſſible to know, and eſpecially to feel, the value of chriſtianity, without a knowledge of the heathen religion, which it happily ſupplanted.

The heathens were wont, as we have ſeen, to aſcribe all the calamities that befel the empire to the diſuſe of their religious rites, and the introduction of chriſtianity; but in this ſhort reign of paganiſm there were ſeveral great public calamities, and among

them dreadful earthquakes, one eſpecially at Alexandria, in which the ſea firſt receded far from the ſhore, and then returned with the moſt deſtructive inundation, riſing higher than the tops of ſeveral houſes; the anniverſary of which, Sozomen ſays, the people of Alexandria obſerved in his time with lamps lighted through the whole city. There was alſo a ſeaſon of great drought during this ſhort reign, followed by a famine, and that by a peſtilence *. To theſe muſt be added the deſtruction of the great part of a fine army, the death of the emperor himſelf, and the conſequent loſs of a great extent of territory, which it was found neceſſary to abandon in order to make peace.

I am far from conſidering theſe things, which are liable to happen at all times, and which actually befel the Roman empire under chriſtian as well as heathen princes, as divine judgments, intended to puniſh the apoſtacy of Julian; but certainly there was nothing either in the length or the proſperity of the reign of Julian, that could lead the heathens of that age to draw any favourable concluſion with reſpect to the power of the gods, to whoſe rites he was ſo much attach-

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. vi. Cap. 2. p. 221. ed.

ed. If any man deſerved well of the heathen gods, it was Julian, who did his utmoſt to reſtore their worſhip, after it had been diſcountenanced, and almoſt ſuppreſſed, in two preceding long reigns; and yet, though all the promiſes of theſe gods reſpected this life only, it is evident that they could do very little for him. In this view the reign of Julian affords a moſt inſtructive leſſon, and no doubt many of the heathens profited by it.

It is uſual for heathens and unbelievers in chriſtianity to make great boaſts of Julian, and ſome chriſtians may have ſpoken of him with too much abhorrence. It appears to me, from the cloſeſt attention that I have been able to give to his conduct, that he had the good qualities of temperance, ingenuity, activity, and perſonal courage, and alſo that of a wiſh to acquire the character of greatneſs and magnanimity; but that his exceſſive vanity and ſuperſtition, muſt compel us to place him in the claſs of men of *little minds*, ſo that he was really incapable of being what it was his great ambition to be thought to be.

Juſtice, with a due proportion of clemency, is the moſt eſſential quality in a truly great prince; but the levity of Julian's temper made him too precipitate in his deci-

ſions, and his partiality to the heathens prevented his being juſt to the chriſtians, who were equally the ſubjects of his empire, and therefore equally entitled to his protection. This appeared on his acceſſion to the empire, and his firſt arrival at the capital. He, no doubt, corrected many abuſes; "but juſtice "herſelf," ſays Ammianus, as quoted by Mr. Gibbon, "wept over the fate of Urſulus, "the treaſurer of the empire, and his blood "accuſed the ingratitude of Julian, whoſe "diſtreſs had been ſeaſonably relieved by the "intrepid liberality of that honeſt miniſter. "The rage of the ſoldiers, whom he had "provoked by his indiſcretion, was the cauſe "and excuſe of his death; and the emperor, "deeply wounded by his own reproaches, "and thoſe of the public, offered ſome con-"ſolation to the family of Urſulus, by the re-"ſtitution of his confiſcated fortune *."

"A devout and ſincere attachment to the "gods of Athens and Rome, conſtituted," as Mr. Gibbon acknowledges, "the ruling "paſſion of Julian. The powers of an en-"lightened underſtanding were betrayed and "corrupted by the influence of ſuperſtitious "prejudice; and the phantom which exiſt-

* Gibbon's Hiſt. Vol. ii. p. 345.

"ed

"ed only in the mind of the emperor, had "a real and pernicious effect on the govern- "ment of the empire*." From his antipathy to the chriſtians "he was ſometimes "tempted," ſays Mr. Gibbon, "by the de- "ſire of victory, or the ſhame of repulſe, to "violate the laws of prudence, and even of "juſtice," as has been abundantly evident in the preceding hiſtory.

It is uſual to compare the character of Julian with that of his uncle Conſtantius, to the great diſadvantage of the latter. But the reign of Julian was ſhort, and many bad reigns have begun well. Temptation requires time to operate; and it appears to me highly probable that, in time, the moderation with which Julian affected to govern, but which he often departed from, would have given way to the moſt wanton cruelty.

Without conſidering the difference between the religion of Julian and that of Conſtantius (though it may be ſuppoſed that a wiſe man would not, in a matter of this conſequence, make a fooliſh choice) it cannot be denied that Julian's attachment to the heathen philoſophers and diviners, was not leſs than that of Conſtantius to the Arian biſhops; his an-

* Hiſt. Vol. ii. p. 356.

tipathy to chriſtianity was not leſs than that of his predeceſſor to Athanaſianiſm, and his cruelty to thoſe who were obnoxious to him, far exceeded any thing that he had ſeen in the preceding reign. Julian's ſchemes to ſubvert chriſtianity, deſerve no other title than that of *cunning*, and have none of the characters of wiſdom, or generoſity. The proceedings of Conſtantius, though reprehenſible, were always open and undiſguiſed. When he was compelled by his brother to receive the man whom he hated the moſt, he did it in a frank and noble manner; and if Athanaſius could have been contented with that advantage, he might have enjoyed his dignity undiſturbed. But the hatred of Julian to all his chriſtian ſubjects was bitter and implacable. Whatever virtues, therefore, we allow him, we cannot give him thoſe of juſtice, greatneſs, or magnanimity.

SECT.

SECTION VIII.

Of the Eccleſiaſtical Events of this Reign.

AFTER the death of George, the Arian biſhop of Alexandria, the great body of chriſtians in that city received Athanaſius, who had returned from baniſhment, with great joy; and in conſequence of this event the Arians were expelled from all the churches, and obliged to hold their aſſemblies in private houſes, and obſcure places, chuſing Lucius to ſucceed George*.

At the ſame time Lucifer biſhop of Sardinia, and Euſebius biſhop of Verceil, returned from their place of exile in Thebais, and after conſidering what they might do to eſtabliſh the diſcipline and peace of the church, it was agreed between them, that Lucifer ſhould go to Antioch, and Euſebius to Alexandria; in order that, holding a ſynod together with Athanaſius, they might ſettle the articles of faith. Lucifer, therefore, appointing a deacon to take his place, and promiſing his aſſent to whatever they ſhould decree, went to Anti-

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. iii. Cap. 4. p. 176.

och, where he found the church in a very unſettled ſtate, and which, after reſiding there ſome time, and uſing his beſt endeavours to compoſe matters between Meletius and Paulinus, the two orthodox biſhops of the place, he left in no better ſtate than he found it. The particulars are not ſuch as deſerve notice at this day, but what was tranſacted by his friend Euſebius and Athanaſius at Alexandria requires our particular attention, as it exhibits another advance in the ſtandard of orthodoxy.

Theſe two biſhops having aſſembled their brethren of that country and the neighbourhood, agreed to aſſert the divinity of the Holy Spirit, as a perſon of the ſame ſubſtance with the two other perſons of the trinity; a new doctrine, which we ſhall find received a firmer eſtabliſhment in a more general council held afterwards at Conſtantinople.

Till this time the catholics had thought differently on the ſubject of the Holy Spirit, without any of them incurring thecharge of hereſy. For ſome of them conſidered the *ſpirit of God* as another term for the *power of God*, and not as a proper *perſon* diſtinct from that of the Father, whoſe ſpirit it was; any more than the ſpirit of a man is a perſon diſtinct from the man whoſe ſpirit

ſpirit it is. And thoſe who did ſuppoſe that the Holy Spirit had proper perſonality, conceived it to have been an intelligent being created by Chriſt; arguing that, ſince *all things that were made*, were made by him, the Holy Spirit alſo muſt have been made by him, and of courſe be inferior to him.

But the Arians having, no doubt, availed themſelves of this doctrine of the inferiority of the Holy Spirit, in favour of that of the inferiority of the Son, the catholics were led to maintain the contrary; and now for the firſt time we find the Holy Spirit, by any public act of a council or ſynod, raiſed to an equality with the Son, and made to be conſubſtantial with him, and with the Father. It was not, however, as yet ſuppoſed that either of theſe two perſons was *equal* to the Father, though they were held to be *of the ſame nature* with him; juſt as, according to the philoſophy of the times, a beam of light was ſuppoſed to proceed from the ſubſtance of the ſun, and to be of the ſame nature with it, yet would not have been ſaid to be equal to it.

It was alſo in this council declared that Chriſt took not only a human body, but alſo a proper human ſoul, which they affirmed, and with great truth, citing ſufficient authorities

ties for it, to have been the opinion of all the ancients. This was in oppoſition to the doctrine of Apollinaris, who maintained that the logos was united to fleſh only, and that the human ſoul was not neceſſary to his perſon. Whether this opinion of Apollinaris was at this time generally received by the Arians does not diſtinctly appear, though they muſt have been inclined to it, and afterwards did adopt it univerſally.

A third and more ſubtle queſtion was diſcuſſed in this council, viz. the proper uſe of the two terms *eſſence* and *hypoſtaſis*, which had often been uſed promiſcuouſly, or without any certain definitions in this controverſy. This ſubject had not been overlooked by Hoſius, when he was ſent into Egypt by Conſtantine, to compoſe the differences which were then firſt occaſioned by the opinions of Arius, though no mention was made of it at the council of Nice. But becauſe the diſtinction between theſe two terms had been much agitated ſince that time, and there was no proſpect that all thoſe who held the doctrine of that council could be brought to agree in the ſame uſe of theſe terms, it was ſettled at this council, that neither of them ſhould be made uſe of with reſpect to God; becauſe the term

eſſence

eſſence is never uſed in the ſcriptures, and the term *hypoſtaſis* only in a borrowed ſenſe.

It was agreed, however, that it was abſolutely neceſſary to make uſe of theſe terms in the controverſy with the Sabellians, leſt, through want of proper terms, it ſhould be thought that there was no difference whatever between the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; whereas each of them was God in his own *hypoſtaſis*, or *perſon*, as it was called in Latin*.

We have no account of any debate in this ſynod, ſo that it is probable that Athanaſius and his particular friends made what decrees they pleaſed, and that the reſt aſſented to them; as Lucifer had promiſed that he would do, whatever they thought proper to decree, without being preſent, or hearing any thing that might be alleged for or againſt any queſtion. To the members of this ſynod Athanaſius read his apology for his flight in the Arian perſecution.

Athanaſius had been very active, and ſucceſsful, not only in keeping the chriſtians firm to their profeſſion, but alſo in converting the heathens; and the emperor being informed of it ordered him, as ſome ſay, to be baniſhed, but according to Theodoret to be

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. iii. Cap. 7. p. 178.

put

put to death. However, he eſcaped in an extraordinary manner. As he was going up the Nile, in order to take refuge in the deſerts of Thebais, he was purſued by ſome perſons whom the governor had ſent to apprehend him; when finding that he ſhould certainly be overtaken by them, he ordered the boat that he was in to turn about, and meet his purſuers. They, not ſuſpecting him to be the perſon who was fleeing from them, only aſked him where Athanaſius was; and he, with great preſence of mind, telling them that he was not far off, they went on, while he returned to Alexandria, where he lay concealed till the death of Julian*.

After the ſynod at Alexandria Euſebius of Verceil followed his friend Lucifer to Antioch, but he there found the catholics divided among themſelves, ſome adhering to Paulinus, who had been ordained by Lucifer, and others to Meletius. He therefore proceeded through Illyricum to Italy, where he found Hilary arrived before him. Theſe two were the great champions of the catholic faith againſt the Arians in the Weſt, and contributed much to the eſtabliſhment of it*.

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. iii. Cap. 14. p. 189. Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. v. Cap. 15. p. 200. Theod. Hiſt. Lib. ii. Cap. p. 9. 130.

* Socratis Hiſt. Cap. 9, 10. p. 184.

As

As Julian did not interfere in the diſputes of the different ſects of chriſtians among themſelves, the Arians were completely formed into two parties in this reign. The more moderate of them (by which I mean thoſe who approached the neareſt to the catholics) at the head of whom were Macedonius, (from whom they were often called *Macedonians*) Eleuſius, Euſtathius, and Sophronius, held ſeveral ſynods, and particularly one at Seleucia, in which they condemned the *Acacians*, as thoſe Arians were called who receded the fartheſt from the catholic faith, but who were more generally termed *Aetians*, or *Eunomians*, all theſe three appellations being derived from the names of the leaders of the party at different times. They rejected the creed of Ariminum, and confirmed that which had been ſettled at the former ſynod of Seleucia, and which was the ſame with that of Antioch.

Being aſked on this occaſion, in what reſpects they differed from the other Arians, they gave, according to Socrates, the following account of the matter. The Eaſtern churches, they ſaid, held that Chriſt was of the ſame ſubſtance with the Father, and the followers of Aetius that he was of a different ſubſtance;

ſubſtance; both which doctrines they held to be impious, whereas they maintained a middle opinion, holding that the ſon was *like the* Father as to his hypoſtaſis. By this means, adds the hiſtorian, they acknowledged the novelty of their opinion, as being a departure from two others, which, therefore, muſt have preceded theirs. This, however, is no neceſſary conſequence *.

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. iii. Cap. 10. p. 185.

PERIOD

PERIOD X.

FROM THE DEATH OF JULIAN, A. D. 362, TO THAT OF VALENS, A. D. 379.

SECTION I.

The Reign of Jovian, conſiſting of ſeven Months.

NOTHING could have been better calculated to ſhew how well eſtabliſhed the more ſerious and thinking part of the Roman empire were in the belief of chriſtianity, and how little hold the principles of heatheniſm had on the minds of men, than the whole of the preceding hiſtory of Julian. The great bulk of mankind, being wholly occupied with the things of this life, think little about religion, in any part of the world. They receive what their anceſtors delivered down to them, and may be ſaid to believe it; but knowing no certain ground

of their faith, they are not prepared to run any riſque for it. This, at leaſt, was the caſe in the Roman empire, with which alone I have at preſent any concern. Now the hiſtory that I am writing ſhews that the heathen ſubjects of the empire were almoſt wholly of this unthinking claſs of men, and that the chriſtians in general were of a very different character, viz. thinking men, well grounded in their faith, and ready to abide by it at all riſques.

From the propagation of chriſtianity to the time of Julian, a period of near three centuries, in which chriſtianity had been a conſtant object of attention, heatheniſm had produced not more than three or four writers againſt the new religion, and none who had ſhewn any readineſs to ſuffer for their principles. Indeed there was nothing in that religion that could produce a ſpirit of martyrdom. It held out nothing for men to die, or to run any riſque, for. Julian himſelf, though, in the reign of Conſtantius, he was a heathen in his heart, and even hated chriſtianity, long and artfully concealed his religion, and probably would never have declared himſelf if he had not been emperor, or had had a good proſpect of becoming one. He had the command

mand of the army in Gaul ſome time before it was diſcovered that he was no chriſtian, and then he ſhewed it with great caution, and only in proportion as he found he could do it with ſafety.

The heathens ſhewed their zeal only in perſecuting the chriſtians, and not in bearing perſecution themſelves. Nay, it does not appear that they ever ſhewed any readineſs to hazard ſo much as to fight for their religion, againſt thoſe whom they knew to be unfriendly to it. Though the heathens were, no doubt, a very great majority of the ſubjects of the Roman empire at the time that Conſtantine declared himſelf a chriſtian, their zeal was no obſtruction to his taking quiet poſſeſſion of the empire, or to his holding it a longer time than any emperor whatever after the promulgation of chriſtianity.

The ſame was the ſtate of things under the ſons of Conſtantine, a period of about fifty years. Even then the majority of the people could hardly be ſaid to be chriſtians, and yet the emperors did whatever they pleaſed, in ſhutting up their temples, demoliſhing their idols, preventing their feſtivals, &c. which would, no doubt, greatly offend their rivetted prejudices; but as the perſons and

the property of the heathens were not touched, it produced no rebellion; and the religion of the emperors, and the meaſures which they thought proper to take in order to promote it, were generally acquieſced in.

It is evident from the ſtate in which Julian actually found things on his acceſſion to the empire, that, notwithſtanding the edicts of the preceding emperors for that purpoſe, the rites of the heathen religion had never been diſcontinued, and that that claſs of people which we call *the mob* was intirely with him. Such are always prepared for every ſpecies of diſſoluteneſs; and they would, no doubt, greatly enjoy the good eating, drinking, and debauchery, which had always been indulged on occaſion of the heathen ſacrifices and feſtivals. But ſuch people as theſe are neither any credit, or firm ſupport of a cauſe. Without leaders of gravity and ability, who can controul their licentiouſneſs, they can do nothing, and without a certainty of ſucceſs they would not, as I have obſerved, even ſeriouſly fight for their religion. Whereas the chriſtians ſhewed their attachment to their religion in every method beſides that of fighting for it.

This appeared both during the reign, and upon the death of Julian. The chriſtians,

eſtabliſhed as they were at the time of his acceſſion, had they been ſo diſpoſed, were no doubt, able to have given him much trouble, and probably might have intirely prevented his enjoyment of the empire. But notwithſtanding the great corruption both of their religion and of their morals, chriſtians had not yet forgotten that they were not to *fight*, but to *die* for their religion; and to the honour of chriſtianity we read of no rebellion, or any thought of rebellion, in the reign of Julian. Had he proceeded to act the part of Diocletian, as in time he probably would have done (for Diocletian had been emperor nineteen years before he attempted ſo much as Julian did againſt chriſtianity in the firſt month or two of his reign) the chriſtians, I doubt not, would have ſubmitted to it as they did then.

The diſpoſition of Julian with reſpect to chriſtians was evidently as hoſtile as that of any of the perſecuting emperors; and if he had been of opinion that he *could* have extirpated them by perſecution, he would certainly have attempted it. But though this was ſufficiently known at the time, his chriſtian ſubjects were as obedient to him, and ſerved him as faithfully, as the heathens.

Though he took great pains to clear his army of chriſtians, he could not do it; and yet, notwithſtanding the army was diſſatisfied with his conduct as a general, and had much reaſon to be ſo, there was no mutiny among them as long as he lived.

That this army was more of a chriſtian than an heathen one, was evident from this circumſtance, that when Julian died (a ſacrifice to his raſhneſs and miſconduct) the man they looked up to was a chriſtian, one who was known to have ſhewn his readineſs to reſign his employment rather than ſacrifice, but whom, in this difficult expedition, it is clear that Julian did not think he could well do without. This was (on the refuſal of Salluſt) Jovian, one of the Tribunes. In the diſtreſs in which the army was involved at that time, we may be aſſured that nothing but an opinion of the greateſt military talents could have recommended any man to their choice; nor was the ſituation of an emperor, in their circumſtances, a thing to be coveted. Accordingly, Jovian declined their offer; but he was not able to reſiſt the importunity of the whole army to take the command, notwithſtanding his known attachment to chriſtianity.

As

As one method of declining their propoſal, he told them that he was a chriſtian, and that he would not command an army of heathens. Had this been a chriſtian army, and any of the heathen officers had declared that they would not command an army of chriſtians, no perſon who has attended to the preceding hiſtory would heſitate to ſay how the negociation would have ended. He would have had no army at all. But what did this army, which Julian had done every thing in his power to train up in the practice of heatheniſm? What hold had this religion, whether newly embraced, or not, upon their minds. They with one voice promiſed that, if he would be their emperor, they would be chriſtians; adding that they were educated in the chriſtian faith, the oldeſt of them under Conſtantine, and the younger under his ſon Conſtantius*.

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. iii. Cap. 23, p. 199. Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. vi. Cap. iii. p. 221. Theod. Hiſt. Lib. iv. Cap. 1. p. 147.

As Ammianus Marcellinus does not mention this circumſtance, it may be thought not to be ſufficiently authentic; but it is ſuch a circumſtance, as a heathen writer may well be ſuppoſed to have choſen to paſs over in ſilence. That the auſpices were taken according to the heathen ritual, which Mr. Gibbon alleges againſt this account of the chriſtian hiſtorian, is no contradiction of it. As theſe auſpices were taken to

I am far from ſaying that I place any value on ſuch chriſtians. But the fact, if it be one, is a ſtriking proof of the little ſincere attachment which this army had to the heathen religion; and though this was done in the time of their diſtreſs, we do not find that they ever repented of it, or declared themſelves heathens, and thought of appointing a heathen emperor, when they were in a place of ſafety. They did not even join the party of Procopius, whom Julian had left at the head of a body of forces in Syria, and whom it is generally thought he deſigned for his ſucceſſor. Sometime after this Procopius did ſet up for the empire, but without ſucceſs.

determine how they ſhould conduct themſelves, after the election of Jovian, Mr. Gibbon might as well have adduced it as a proof that Jovian himſelf was a heathen, though Ammianus ſays that he was a zealous chriſtian, *Chriſtianæ legis ſtudioſus*, Lib. xxv. p. 330. In the confuſion and diſtreſs in which the army then was, each party would practice their religious rites, without conſulting any one. Am. Marcellinus, Lib. xxv. p. 318. It is evident, at leaſt, that the army did not reject him on account of his attachment to chriſtianity; and though, according to Ammianus he was at firſt named emperor by a few only, their choice was approved by all the reſt, and no other emperor appears to have been thought of while he lived. When be died, Valentinian, a man who had been baniſhed by Julian for his chriſtian zeal, was choſen by the ſame army. I do not ſee therefore, but that it is very poſſible they might have choſen Jovian in the manner that is deſcribed by the chriſtian hiſtorians.

On

On being proclaimed emperor, Jovian made a peace with the Perſians on the beſt terms that he could; and both the army and the empire were convinced that, diſgraceful as it was, it was better than could have been reaſonably expected, in the embarraſſing circumſtances into which the raſhneſs of Julian had brought them.

The heathens, no doubt, lamented the death of Julian, and Libanius the ſophiſt wrote an encomium upon him, particularly recommending his work againſt chriſtianity. This work, however, from the particular anſwer to it by Cyril, and every thing that we can collect concerning it, appears to have contained nothing new or important, but to have borne marks of the moſt inveterate prejudice and antipathy, a ſure indication of a mind not ſufficiently candid to give the arguments in favour of chriſtianity their proper weight.

Accordingly, it does not appear that this work of Julian, which had more of humour than of argument in it, made a ſerious impreſſion on any perſon whatever, notwithſtanding the ſingular advantage of having an emperor for its author. The only ſeeming advantage which Julian had aroſe from the doctrine

doctrine of the divinity of Chriſt, which had been embraced by too many of the leading chriſtians of his time. The manner in which Libanius ſpeaks of this work ſufficiently ſhews this. "In the long nights of the winter he "wrote thoſe books which ſhew the folly of "that religion which teaches that a man of "Paleſtine was a God, and the ſon of God." What Socrates ſays, in reply to Julian's ridiculing chriſtianity for thus deifying a man, ſhews to what difficulties chriſtians were reduced by this doctrine. "Heathens, he ſays, "cannot underſtand this doctrine till they be-"lieve it," and for this purpoſe he quotes Iſ. chap. vi. *Unleſs ye believe, ye will not underſtand**.

We have now another chriſtian emperor, and one who, as far as we can judge, had the prudence and good ſenſe not to tread in the ſteps of Conſtantine and his ſons, who had favoured that party of chriſtians to which themſelves were attached, and perſecuted all the reſt much more than they did the heathens. The reign of Jovian did not extend to many months; but in that time he might have laid a foundation for his future meaſures. But though it is very probable that he himſelf

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. iii. Cap. 23. p. 203.

was

was a conſubſtantialiſt, he does not appear to have ſhewn much more favour, at leaſt, to that party than to the others. He wrote however, it is ſaid, to Athanaſius, who had returned to his ſee on the death of Julian, together with other orthodox biſhops who had been baniſhed by Conſtantius, and for ſome reaſon or other had not been reſtored till they were expreſſly recalled by this emperor.

In this letter Theodoret ſays that Jovian deſired Athanaſius to ſend him an accurate account of theology, and that Athanaſius, aſſembling thoſe biſhops whom he thought the beſt informed, wrote to Jovian to perſuade him to adhere to the Nicene faith; telling him that it was the faith of all the chriſtian churches, both in the Weſt and in the Eaſt, except a very few who were of the Arian opinion, and that to this letter he ſubjoined a copy of the Nicene creed *. But Philoſtorgius ſays that Candidus and Arianus, who were near relations of the emperor, prevented Athanaſius (who had gone to Edeſſa to meet him, and endeavour to get into his good graces) from effecting his purpoſe; that the emperor heard what was ſaid by both the parties, but,

* Theod. Hiſt. Lib. iv. Cap. 2, 3. p. 148, &c.

without

without declaring for either, referred the diſcuſſion of their differences to another time*.

The opinion, and the meaſures, of the new emperor were certainly of great conſequence to all the different ſects, and therefore, on his arrival in the Roman territories, or as ſoon as it could be ſuppoſed that he could be at leiſure for any thing of the kind, he would, no doubt, be waited upon, as Socrates ſays he was, by perſons of every communion, hoping to gain him to their party. But I wiſh to think that one emperor at leaſt might be able to give to them all ſuch an anſwer as he did to one of the parties of Arians.

Thoſe who held the opinion which Conſtantius had always contended for, viz, Baſil of Ancyra, Sylvanus of Tarſus, and Sophronius of Pompeiopolis, who had oppoſed the doctrines of the Anomæans, and maintained that the Son was of a ſubſtance *ſimilar* to that of the Father, addreſſed Jovian, to congratulate him on his acceſſion to the empire, and requeſted that what had been ſettled at Ariminum or Seleucia might ſtand, and every thing elſe be ſet aſide, as done by factious perſons; or that an univerſal council ſhould be held, and

† Philoſtorgii Hiſt. Lib. viii. Cap. 6. p. 523.

that

that thoſe who had met in different places in the reign of Conſtantius ſhould not be regarded. It is alſo ſaid that this party, who are frequently called *Macedonians*, farther requeſted, that the other party of Arians, who held that the ſon was *diſſimilar* to the Father, might be baniſhed, and biſhops of their own perſuaſion put in their places. But Jovian returned their addreſs without any other anſwer than that he diſliked contention, but loved thoſe who were friends of concord; and this proper anſwer, it is ſaid, checked all farther altercation *.

About the ſame time a ſynod was held at Antioch, at which were preſent Euſebius of Samoſata, Pelagius of Laodicea in Syria, Acacius of Cæſarea in Paleſtine, Irenio of Gaza, and Athanaſius of Ancyra, joined with Meletius of Antioch, who was a conſubſtantialiſt, and preſented a paper in which they expreſſed their approbation of the Nicene creed, ſubjoining a copy of it, merely, ſays Socrates, becauſe they thought the emperor approved of it. It was preſented by Meletius, and he found it in a book of Sabinus, intitled *a collection of the acts of ſynods*. In this

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. iii. Cap. 25. p. 206. Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. vi. Cap. 4. p. 222.

addreſs

addreſs they ſay they acknowledge the neceſſity of ſome ſtandard of faith, and that they had always adhered to the creed which had been made at Nice, according to the cautious explanation of ſo unuſual a word as that of *conſubſtantial* by the Fathers, viz. that it expreſſes the Son being *produced without paſſion*, and his being *like* to the Father, as to his ſubſtance; that it is not to be underſtood in the ſenſe in which the Greeks had uſed the word *ſubſtance*, but had been adopted for the purpoſe of refuting Arius, who had ſaid that Chriſt was produced *out of nothing*; an opinion which the Anomæans, who had lately ſprung up, had boldly and impudently aſſerted, to the deſtruction of the peace of the church.

Notwithſtanding the cenſure of the hiſtorian, I have no doubt but that the generality of thoſe who ſigned this addreſs were very ſincere, becauſe Euſebius of Nicomedia, and the other heads of the ſame party, which prevailed in the reign of Conſtantius, had no objection to the Nicene creed, except what aroſe from the term *conſubſtantial*, and *this* they made no ſcruple of receiving when it was explained in this manner. The only perſon who can, with any probability, be

charged with prevaricating on this occaſion, was Acacius of Cæſarea, becauſe in the late reign he had joined the Aetians. Though Meletius admitted the above-mentioned explanation of the term *conſubſtantial*, Paulinus, the other orthodox biſhop of Antioch, condemned it.

The anſwer which Jovian made to this addreſs was to the ſame purpoſe with the former, viz. that he would diſturb no perſon on account of his faith; but that he would love and eſteem above all the reſt thoſe who exerted themſelves the moſt to reſtore the peace of the church. This was indeed worthy of a great prince.

Themiſtius the philoſopher, in an oration which he wrote on his conſulſhip, highly commands this emperor for theſe generous ſentiments, for giving liberty to all people to worſhip as they pleaſed, and repreſſing all flattery*.

As this heathen philoſopher praiſed this emperor for his univerſal toleration on the ſubject of religion, it does not appear to me to be at all probable that, on his acceſſion to the empire, he ordered, as Socrates ſays, all the heathen temples to be ſhut up, ſo that

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. iii. Cap. 25. p. 208

the

the heathen prieſts preſently abſconded, and that an immediate end was put to all the buſineſs of public ſacrificing, with which all men had been diſguſted in the reign of Julian; though no doubt, whatever of this kind had been done to pleaſe Julian would be diſcontinued. It is probable alſo that what he ſays of the heathen philoſophers, who had flocked in crouds to the court of Julian, being now glad to change their peculiar habits, and to mix with the croud, dreſſed like other people, would be in a great meaſure true *.

That Jovian gave no orders for the ſuppreſſion of heatheniſm is the more probable, as it was always ſaid that his ſucceſſor Valens, who perſecuted all the chriſtians who were not of his perſuaſion, left the heathens unmoleſted; and as we do not know that he either made, or altered, any laws relating to that ſubject, it is probable that, in this reſpect, he acted as his predeceſſor had done.

We do not find that any perſon was, in fact, moleſted on account of his religion in this reign, and though a ſhort one, it allowed him time ſufficient for that purpoſe. Jovian may therefore be conſidered as having been ſincere in his declarations againſt perſecution, and in

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. iii. Cap. 24. p. 205.

favour

favour of univerſal toleration, and if he had lived longer, he would (whatever had been his own private opinions) it may be hoped, have been ſuch a model for other princes with reſpect to their conduct in matters of religion, as had not been given by any of his predeceſſors, and which has been followed by very few who have come after him. But this prince died ſuddenly, before he reached Conſtantinople, in a room in which he ſlept; owing, as was generally thought, either to its having been newly plaiſtered, or which will now be thought much more probable, to the fumes of charcoal that were burning in it. Ammianus Marcellinus ſays that Jovian was addicted to wine and women; but he ſays that he was of a benevolent diſpoſition, and of a chearful temper*.

* Lib. xxv. p. 330.

SECTION II.

From the Acceſſion of Valentinian and Valens, A. D. 364, to the Death of Athanaſius A. D. 371, containing an Account of the Perſecution of the Catholics, and the moderate Arians by Valens.

JOVIAN being dead, the choice of the army fell upon Valentinian, the ſame who has been mentioned as thinking himſelf defiled by the holy water with which he was ſprinkled, when he was entering a heathen temple together with Julian, and whom he had baniſhed on pretence of ſome deficiency in his military duty, but who had been recalled by Jovian, and had met him at Nice. At the requeſt of the ſoldiers, Valentinian made Valens his brother partner with him in the empire, and aſſigned to him the government of the Eaſt, while he took upon himſelf that of the Weſt.

It happened that the two brothers were of different opinions on the ſubject of the trinity, Valentinian adhering to the Nicene creed

creed, but without perſecuting the Arians; while Valens, who had been brought up under Eudoxius, was not only a ſtrenuous aſſerter of the Arian doctrine, and in its more obnoxious form, viz. that of the *Anomæans*, but an unrelenting perſecutor both of the Conſubſtantialiſts and of the other Arians.

The ſtate of parties, and the ſituation of the principal biſhops at the acceſſion of theſe two emperors, are thus ſtated by Socrates. Liberius was biſhop of Rome. At Alexandria Athanaſius was at the head of the Conſubſtantialiſts, and Lucius of the Arians. At Antioch Euzoius was at the head of the Arians, and Paulinus and Meletius at the head of ſeparate congregations of Conſubſtantialiſts. Cyril was at Jeruſalem, and Eudoxius the Arian at Conſtantinople, though the Conſubſtantialiſts had a ſmall congregation in the city, and the Macedonians, who had ſeparated from the Acacians at Seleucia, had churches of their own in ſeveral cities *.

Valens ſoon diſcovered his attachment to the Arian party by baniſhing Meletius from Antioch, though he ſuffered Paulinus to remain there on account of his high character for piety: but he baniſhed all others who refuſed to communicate with Euzoius.

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. iv. Cap. 1. p. 213. Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. vi. Cap 6. p. 225.

The biſhops of the Macedonian party having applied to the emperor to call a council; he, thinking that they did not differ from Eudoxius and Acacius, conſented to it; and accordingly they met at Lampſacum, ſeven years after the holding of the ſynod at Seleucia; and there they confirmed the creed which had been compoſed at Antioch, and which had again been ſubſcribed at Seleucia, condemning that of Ariminum, to which the hiſtorian ſays they had themſelves conſented. They alſo paſſed a ſentence of depoſition againſt the followers of Acacius and Eudoxius, the latter not having been able to prevent this deciſion, on account of the civil war with Procopius, which was then depending, and which prevented the emperor from attending to eccleſiaſtical matters *; ſo that Eleuſius of Cyzicum had the upper hand, maintaining the opinion of Macedonius, which, he ſays, had made but little progreſs before; but the confirmation of it in this ſynod he took to be the reaſon why it afterwards prevailed ſo much on the borders of the Helleſpont.

* Procopius was a formidable rival of Valens a conſiderable time. He was received with great joy at Conſtantinople, but was at length deſerted by his chief ſupporters, on account of his grievous exactions, for which the government of Valens had been complained of.

Thus

Thus the doctrine of the Son being *like* the Father was for the preſent eſtabliſhed. But Eudoxius having given his repreſentation of the matter to the emperor, he preſently annulled all the decrees of the council, and ſending the members of it into baniſhment, he gave their churches to the friends of Eudoxius *.

Valens having ſuppreſſed the rebellion of Procopius, ſhewed his reſentment at what had been done at Lampſacum, by compelling Eleuſius, who had diſtinguiſhed himſelf the moſt in favour of the Macedonian party, to aſſent to the doctrine of the Anomæans, which Socrates calls that of the *Arians;* and indeed properly enough, as their doctrine of of the Son being *unlike* the Father, was the natural and neceſſary conſequence of what had been aſſerted by Arius, that the Son was *made out of nothing*, while the Father alone was uncreated.

Eleuſius, however, ſoon repented of his compliance, and in the preſence of his congregation acknowledged himſelf unworthy of being their biſhop, as he had denied the faith. But they, greatly reſpecting his virtues, in-

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. iv. Cap. 4. p. 216. Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. vi. Cap. 7. p. 227.

ſiſted upon his continuing to be their paſtor, which he would have done, but that Eudoxius, having ordained Eunomius the biſhop of Cyzicum, he was obliged, by the orders of the emperor, to quit the place, and his followers built a ſmall church for themſelves without the city. Eunomius, however, not being able to recommend himſelf to his congregation, was obliged to leave the place, and to take refuge with Eudoxius at Conſtantinople*.

About this time, which was the twelfth year after the deſtruction of Nicomedia by an earthquake, there was another which deſtroyed the city of Nice, and after this a third which overthrew part of the city of Germa on the Helleſpont, preceded by a fall of large hail ſtones at Conſtantinople. Theſe were interpreted by the orthodox party as divine judgments for the favour that was ſhewn to the Arians. But, ſays Socrates, neither Eudoxius nor Valens regarded them, but ſtill went on baniſhing the orthodox biſhops. Two, however, by particular providence, eſcaped, viz. Baſil of Cæſarea in Cappadocia, and Gregory of Nazianzum, in its neighbourhood, the former of whom obtained the ſirname of *the great*, and the latter that of

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. iv. Cap. 6, 7, 8. p. 217, &c.

theologus,

theologus, or *the divine*; and we ſhall find them acting an extraordinary part, in carrying the ſyſtem of orthodoxy higher than any perſons had done before them *.

The vanity of all attempts to controul mens opinions by force, or to engage them, by any kind of intrigue, to ſubſcribe what they do not really believe, appeared remarkably in the general, and to all appearance the cordial, reception, which was given to the Nicene faith in the Weſtern empire, preſently after the death of Conſtantius, who had taken ſo much pains to change it, and who had ſo far ſucceeded, as to compel all the biſhops to ſubſcribe the creed which had been preſented at Ariminum. Now, however, owing in part to the influence of Valentinian, who was a Conſubſtantialiſt, and in part to their former prejudices (to which the ſentiments of their maſters Conſtantine and Conſtans, the ſons of Conſtantine the Great, as well as thoſe of the father himſelf, no doubt contributed) the Weſtern biſhops in general, and Liberius himſelf at their head, were the avowed advocates of the Nicene faith. And the ſee of Rome, being conſidered as at the head of the whole Weſtern church, which was in concord with it,

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. iv. Cap. 11. p. 223.

was now as much as in any preceding time, the common refuge of the diſtreſſed in any part of the empire. A biſhop in communion with this great ſee, the influence of which, without any formal agreement, or act of council, was ſo overbearing, could not be deſpiſed or trampled upon, whatever his neighbours might think of him.

So tyrannical were the proceedings of Valens, and thoſe of the high Arian or Anomœan party, that the Conſubſtantialiſts were almoſt exterminated in all the Eaſtern empire; and that in Thrace, Bythinia, the country about the Helleſpont, and even the provinces more to the Eaſt, they had neither churches nor clergy. The Macedonians alſo, or the more moderate Arians, were dreadfully harraſſed. In this ſituation, alarmed at the proſpect of the evils impending over them, they conferred together by meſſengers (for they could not meet in a body) and agreed to have recourſe to Valentinian, and the biſhop of Rome, and to join their communion, rather than that of Valens and Eudoxius. Agreeing, therefore, with the Conſubſtantialiſts, they ſent a ſolemn embaſſy to Italy, conſiſting of Euſtathius biſhop of Sebaſtia, who had been ſo often depoſed, Sylvanus of Tarſus, and Theophilus,

Theophilus of Caſtabala in Cilicia, to inform Valentinian and the pope (as by anticipation we may now call the biſhop of Rome) that that they wiſhed to be in communion with them, ſince they did not differ in reſpect to articles of faith, but held the Conſubſtantial doctrine.

The emperor not being at Rome, theſe ambaſſadors were received by Liberius alone, and at firſt he expreſſed much diſtruſt of them, as having been of the Arian party. But they aſſured him that they had repented, that they reprobated the doctrine of the Anomœans, and were really Conſubſtantialiſts as well as himſelf, confeſſing that the Son did not differ in any reſpect from the Father; and indeed that by the phraſe *of the like ſubſtance*, they never had any meaning different from that which had been annexed to the phraſe of *the ſame ſubſtance*. This verbal acknowledgment, though it was as expreſs as words could make it, not removing all ſuſpicion, theſe ambaſſadors gave Liberius a copy of their faith in writing, in which they expreſſed in the fulleſt manner their conſent to the Homoouſian doctrine, and ſubjoined the Nicene creed itſelf.

Upon

Upon this Liberius deferred no longer to receive them into his communion. He moreover wrote in their favour to the principal biſhops in the Eaſt, acquainting them with the ſatisfaction which they had given him. He alſo took this opportunity of aſſuring them that, though the biſhops of the Weſt had been deceived at Ariminum, they had all abjured the blaſphemies of that council, and were unanimous in their adherence to the faith of Nice. He exhorts them to do the ſame that *they* had done, if they had been drawn aſide by force or artifice; and he concludes with declaring, that they ſhould hold no communion with any who would not now reject all the blaſphemies of Arius, together with thoſe of the Sabellians, and other heretics.

With theſe letters the ambaſſadors went to Sicily; and having called a ſynod of the biſhops of that iſland, and made profeſſion of the Nicene faith before them, they received letters from them ſimilar to thoſe of Liberius. With all theſe letters they returned to their friends in the Eaſt, whom they found aſſembled at Tyanis, and among them were Euſebius of Cæſarea in Cappadocia, Athanaſius of Ancyra, Pelagius of Laodicea, Zeno of Tyre, Paul

Paul of Emeſa, Gregory of Nazianzum, and many others, who had met at Antioch in the time of Jovian, and had there aſſented to the Nicene creed.

Being greatly encouraged by the reception which their ambaſſadors had met with in the Weſt, they propoſed to call a council at Tarſus, and there make profeſſion of the Nicene faith; but they were prevented by Eudoxius, whoſe influence with Valens was ſo great, that he was more exaſperated againſt thoſe biſhops than ever*.

They were alſo farther diſcouraged by what paſſed at an aſſembly of thirty four biſhops of Aſia proper. For though theſe approved the zeal of their brethren to unite the churches, they objected to the term *conſubſtantial*, and declared their preference of the creed of Antioch and Seleucia, as having been compoſed by Lucian the Martyr, and approved by their anceſtors.

The emperor, not content with forbidding the council at Tarſus, ordered that all the biſhops who had been depoſed in the time of Conſtantius, and had not recovered the poſſeſſion of their ſees in the time of Julian, ſhould be expelled from their churches.

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. iv. Cap. 12. p. 223. Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. vi. Cap. 10. p. 230.

The

The magiſtrates of Egypt, having received this order, endeavoured to carry it into execution with reſpect to Athanaſius, notwithſtanding the objection of his numerous friends, who alleged that he did not come under the deſcription of the biſhops who were to be baniſhed, as having been recalled by Conſtantius himſelf, and afterwards expelled by Julian.

Though the governor ſeemed to acquieſce in this plea, Athanaſius, probably fearing the conſequences of a tumult, withdrew of his own accord and concealed himſelf. Afterwards the emperor himſelf wrote to him to invite him to return, probably fearing the reſentment of his brother on his account. The Arians themſelves alſo thought that he might be the cauſe of more diſturbance out of his ſee than in it.

This caſe of Athanaſius himſelf excepted, Sozomen ſays that this perſecution of Valens very much reſembled that of the heathens, all being baniſhed who would not receive the creed of the emperor*.

Eudoxius dying after he had held the ſee of Conſtantinople eleven years according to Sozomen, and nineteen according to Socrates,

* Lib. vi. Cap. 12. p. 233. Socratis Hiſt. Lib. iv. Cap. 13. p. 229.

Demo-

Demophilus was chosen by the Arians to succeed him. But the advocates for the Nicene faith took this opportunity of ordaining Evagrius by means of Eustathius, who had formerly been of Antioch, but having been recalled from banishment by Jovian, lived at Constantinople. A great disturbance beginning to be occasioned by this event, the emperor banished both Evagrius and Eustathius *.

The Arians, encouraged by this success, were more than ever insolent and outrageous, which compelled the other party to have recourse to the justice and clemency of the emperor. But instead of obtaining any redress of their grievances, they are said to have been treated with a degree of treachery and cruelty so shocking to humanity as not to be at all credible. Eighty of the catholic clergy, the chief of whom were Urbanus, Theodorus, and Menedemus, waiting upon the emperor at Nicomedia, to beg his protection against the violence of the Arians, he was very much provoked, but without expressing much anger at the time, he is said to have given orders to Modestus the præfect to put them all to death. This inhuman order the officer is said to have executed by sending these eighty

* Sozomeni Hist. Lib. vi. Cap. 13. p. 235. Socratis Hist. Lib. iv. Cap. 14. p. 230.

biſhops to ſea, as if they were going into baniſhment, and privately ordering the crew to ſet the ſhip on fire, and then leave it. In conſequence of this the ſhip was burned, and they all periſhed miſerably. A famine which after this event afflicted all Phrygia was thought to be a puniſhment for this cruelty and injuſtice *. That the biſhops were ſent to baniſhment, and that they periſhed by the ſhip taking fire, is not improbable; but that this was done by order of the emperor, or of the præfect, is highly improbable. As to the famine, in order to its being a proper judgment in this caſe, it ought to have affected the emperor and his Arian ſubjects only.

Not ſatisfied with this act of cruelty, the emperor, being at Antioch, is ſaid to have perſecuted the Conſubſtantialiſts more than ever, putting many of them to death in various ways, and ſome by throwing them into the river † It muſt be conſidered, however, that all the hiſtorians are Conſubſtantialiſts, that no names of any perſons ſo put to death are mentioned, and that Sozomen contents himſelf with ſaying that ſuch things were *ſaid* to have been done ‡.

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. iv. Cap. 16. p. 331. Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. vi. Cap. 14. p. 236.

† Socratis Hiſt. Cap. 17. p. 232.

‡ Hiſt. Lib. vi. Cap. 18 p. 240.

The

The people of Edeſſa, according to our hiſtorians, were ſaved from a general maſſacre by the intrepidity of a woman. The emperor deſiring to ſee a church in that city, and being offended at the crouds of people who were aſſembled on that occaſion, ordered them all to be put to death, notwithſtanding the earneſt remonſtrances of the military officer, merely becauſe they were Conſubſtantialiſts. The order however, being given, many perſons refrained from going to the place. But very early in the morning a woman with a child in her arms preſented herſelf; and when the officer would have diſmiſſed her, by reminding her of his orders, ſhe ſaid ſhe had heard of them, and that ſhe had come on purpoſe to ſuffer martyrdom, and likewiſe to give her child that honour. The emperor, it is ſaid, ſeeing the reſolution of the people, recalled his order*. But it is not at all credible that any ſuch order was ever given.

While Athanaſius lived the emperor did not think proper to diſturb the Conſubſtantialiſts in Egypt. But he dying† in the ſecond conſul-

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. iv. Cap. 18. p. 233. Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. vi. Cap. 18. p. 240.

† Notwithſtanding the figure that Athanaſius makes in the eccleſiaſtical hiſtory of his age, and his long continuance on the public theatre of action, we have no *data* by which to form a juſt idea of his character in private life.

ſhip of Gratius, and the firſt of Probus, and Peter another Conſubſtantialiſt being choſen in his place, the Arians took that opportunity of ſeizing upon the churches of Egypt. The emperor being then at Antioch, Euzoius the biſhop of that city prevailed upon him to ſend him thither, in order to place Lucius an Arian in the ſee of Alexandria; and this he effected by a military force, impriſoning and diſperſing the orthodox clergy; the commanding officer having orders to baniſh all thoſe whom Lucius ſhould think proper to be ſo diſpoſed of. Some of them, it is ſaid, were tortured. Peter himſelf, having made his eſcape, fled to Damaſus biſhop of Rome *.

The monks of Egypt being zealous advocates for the Nicene faith, Lucius, not being able to gain them over by perſuaſion, employed force†; and taking with him the military

life. All we know of him is that he was a ſteady champion for the Nicene faith, and muſt have been poſſeſſed of a conſiderable degree of firmneſs and reſolution, though he does not appear to have had the ſpirit of martyrdom that Mr. Gibbon aſcribes to him.

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. iv. Cap. 20, 21, 22. p. 234, &c. Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. vi. Cap. 19. p. 241.

† Fleury ſays he made a law to compel them to bear arms. It is probable that many perſons choſe this idle mode of life, who had conſiderable property, and endeavoured by this means to exempt themſelves from an obligation to civil offices.

commander

commander of Egypt, advanced againſt them into the deſert. But though he exerciſed great cruelties upon them, it was without any effect; ſo that at length he deſiſted from his attempts. At this time there were ſeveral monks of great eminence in Egypt, particularly the two Macarii, Pambo, Heraclides, and other diſciples of Anthony, Ammon, Didymus, Arſenius, Iſidorus, and Ammonius; of all of whom many idle things are related by Socrates and others, not worth repeating after them*. A great champion of the Trinitarians at this time in Egypt, was Didymus, a blind man, but who excelled in all branches of ſcience. He wrote three books on the ſubject of the trinity †.

According to Sozomen, a great majority of the Egyptians at this time adhered to the Nicene faith. It was alſo preached among the Oſdroeni, and in Cappadocia, by Baſil of Cæſarea and Gregory of Nazianzum. At Antioch he acknowledges that the Arians were the moſt numerous, though the catholics were not few. The Scythians he alſo ſays, retained the orthodox faith, which was

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. iv. Cap. 23, 24. p. 236. Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. vi. Cap. 20. p. 242.

† Socratis Hiſt. Lib. iv. Cap. 25. p. 244.

profeſſed by Vetranio their biſhop. The emperor, paying him a viſit would have perſuaded him to communicate with the Arians; but finding that the people would not communicate even with himſelf, he ordered the biſhop to be baniſhed. Seeing, however, that the people took this very ill, he revoked his order. This was at Tomi, on the Euxine ſea, the capital of the Scythians, who were at that time an uſeful barrier between the empire and the more northern barbarians *.

This violent perſecution of the orthodox, Socrates ſays, was in a great meaſure repreſſed by the remonſtrances of Themiſtius, a heathen philoſopher, who addreſſed the emperor on the ſubject, at Antioch; repreſenting to him, that the difference of opinion among chriſtians was not near ſo great as among the Greeks, whoſe ſects amounted in all to more than three hundred, and that the Deity was pleaſed with this diverſity of opinion, becauſe it appeared by this very circumſtance, that his majeſty was ſo great, that it was difficult to attain to the knowledge of it. Upon this it is ſaid that Valens refrained from perſecuting any to death, and contented himſelf with baniſhing thoſe who were ob-

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. vi. Cap. 21. p. 244.

noxious

noxious to him*. This is the firſt inſtance we have met with of any heathen philoſopher pleading the cauſe of toleration. But it was only when the heathens ſtood in need of toleration themſelves, and when the experience of ſome centuries had opened their eyes with reſpect to the folly of perſecution. Valens's engagement in the Gothic war is ſaid to have been another reaſon of his ceaſing to perſecute the orthodox. Having left Antioch to go upon this expedition, the orthodox party in Alexandria, encouraged by the letters which Peter had brought from Damaſus the biſhop of Rome, expelled Lucius the Arian biſhop, and put Peter in his place†.

What makes it almoſt certain that the account of the perſecution of the orthodox by Valens is much exaggerated by the hiſtorians, and that he never proceeded farther than the baniſhment of the biſhops who were obnoxious to him (which had been done in the former reigns) is, that the biſhops who compoſed the council at Conſtantinople in the time of Theodoſius ſay nothing of the puniſhment of death, or of any thing beſides baniſhment, in their ſynodical letter, in which they enume-

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. iv. Cap. 32. p. 255.
† Ibid. Cap. 35, 37. p. 257, 258.

rate all their hardſhips under Valens. One Stephen, indeed, is ſaid to have been ſtoned to death after his return from baniſhment. But this was probably by the mob, and after the death of Valens *.

SECTION III.

Of Baſil the Great, and Gregory of Nazianzum with the Change that took Place in the Doctrine of the Trinity chiefly by their Means.

WHILE, after the death of Athanaſius, Didymus, as I have obſerved, was oppoſing the Arians in Egypt, the catholic faith had two moſt able defenders in Aſia minor, viz. Baſil of Cæſarea, and Gregory of Nazianzum, of whom, becauſe they carried the doctrine of the trinity to its preſent height, and alſo greatly diſtinguiſhed themſelves by their eloquence and their writings, I ſhall give a more particular account.

When they were young men they both ſtudied at Athens, under the celebrated Sophiſts Himerius and Prohæreſius, where they

* Theod. Hiſt. Lib. v. Cap. 9. p. 203.

were

were acquainted with Julian, and after this they attended the lectures of Libanius at Antioch. Being there famous for their eloquence, they were by ſome adviſed to teach it, and by others to apply to the bar. But deſpiſing theſe arts, they both betook themſelves to the monaſtic life, which was in great vogue at that time, and conſidered as the higheſt pitch of religion. They alſo particularly applied themſelves to the ſtudy of the works of Origen; and whereas the writings of this great man had been thought to favour the Arians, they took great pains to ſhew that he had been miſunderſtood, and that his works were really favourable to the contrary doctrine.

Baſil was firſt promoted to the rank of deacon by Meletius of Antioch. Afterwards he went to Cæſarea in Cappadocia, the place of his nativity, where Euſebius was then biſhop; but differing with him, and the other clergy of the place, he retired to the Monks of Pontus. This flight of Baſil greatly encouraged the Arian party; but afterwards returning to Cæſarea, he was reconciled to Euſebius, and ſucceeded to the biſhoprick after his death. In the mean time his friend Gregory ſtrenuouſly ſupport-

ed the trinitarian doctrine at Nazianzum, where his father had been biſhop, and afterwards at Conſtantinople, where himſelf was biſhop for ſome time in the reign of Theodoſius.

Valens, hearing how much theſe two men exerted themſelves in oppoſing his favourite ſyſtem, ſent for Baſil to Antioch, and after ſome diſcourſe on the ſubject, it is ſaid, threatened him with death, if he did not embrace his faith. Baſil was ſo far from being intimidated by this threatening, that, in an inſulting manner (which ſeems to ſhew that he did not think he had much to fear) he challenged the emperor to put him to death. But the hiſtorian ſays that when he was under confinement, a ſon of the emperor was taken very ill, and that the father, being alarmed, ſent for Baſil, and told him that if his was the right faith the child would be reſtored to his prayers. Baſil replied that, if the emperor believed as he himſelf did, and the church ſhould by that means be united, he could aſſure him that his child would recover. But preſently after he died, and the emperor diſmiſſed the biſhop. This ſtory having ſo much the air of fable, it is probable that the whole hiſtory of Baſil being threatened with death, and of his behaviour

on that occaſion, with which it is connected, is intitled to very little credit.

Baſil had two brothers, Peter and Gregory, of whom the former was devoted to a monaſtic life; but Gregory even rivalled his brother in eloquence, and was afterwards biſhop of Niſſa in Cappadocia *.

It is in the writings of theſe three champions of orthodoxy, that we firſt find the high trinitarian doctrine of the *full equality* of the Son to the Father. The Antinicene Fathers had uniformly maintained the great inferiority of the Son to the Father, as they did that of a beam of light to the ſun. The Nicene Fathers went no farther than to aſſert that the Son was *of the ſame ſubſtance* with the Father, and nothing was ſaid of his *equality* to him till this period, though it is no difficult conſequence from the idea of his being of the ſame ſubſtance, and therefore *truly God*. Becauſe if he be of the ſame nature with the Father, and as truly God as he is, he cannot want any attribute of proper divinity, and therefore muſt be *in all reſpects* equal to the Father.

This doctrine, however, would have ſtaggered the chriſtian world, and eſpecially the

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. iv. Cap. 26. p. 245. Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. vi. Cap. 15, 16, 17. p. 237, &c.

common people, who were well grounded in the doctrine of the *unity of God*, too much, to have been borne with any patience, in an earlier period. Beſides, it is only by giving much attention to any propoſition that all its conſequences are diſtinctly perceived. But all the real conſequences of any acknowledged doctrine muſt at length be admitted; and whatever repugnance there may be in the minds of any perſons to the admiſſion of them, it muſt give way in time. Now controverſy, more than any thing elſe, draws the attention of men to their principles, and to all the conſequences of them; and this it was which at length produced the doctrine of the trinity, as it was maintained by theſe three writers, and as it has been explained and defended from their time to the preſent, though it did not immediately obtain the ſanction of any council.

Athanaſius does not appear to have advanced any farther than the doctrine of *conſubſtantiality*, and that of God having *always* been *a Father*; but that the Son is *equal* to the Father, does not, I believe, occur in any of his writings, not even the lateſt of them. This doctrine, however, is expreſſed in a great variety of phraſes, and is ſtrenuouſly contend-

ed

ed for in the writings of the three champions of orthodoxy who are now before us. "The "Son," says Basil, "is all that the Father "is*." "There is," says Gregory of Nissa, "a whole Father in a whole Son, and a whole "Son in a whole Father†." "Whoever," says Gregory of Nazianzum, "maintains "that any of the three persons is inferior to "the other, overturns the whole trinity‡."

The orthodox having now three persons in the trinity, each of them possessed of all the attributes of divinity, found themselves more embarrassed than ever with the objection to their doctrine, as making *more Gods than one*. For unquestionably, if the Father, Son, and Spirit, separately considered, be each of them possessed of all divine attributes, in the same degree, there must be *three* complete Gods, and not *one* only. The orthodox writers of this age, therefore, were obliged to have recourse to new illustrations of their doctrine, unknown to their predecessors, which may be seen in my *History of early Opinions concerning Christ*.

But being obliged to acknowledge that all their illustrations were deficient, they had

* De Fide Opera, Vol. i. p. 430.
† Opera Vol. ii. p. 901.
‡ Or. xx. Opera, p. 338.

another

another reſource, equally unknown in former ages, which was that the doctrine of the trinity was a *myſtery*, abſolutely inexplicable by reaſon, and to be received by *faith* only; and whatever is incomprehenſible to us in nature was now firſt adduced as an argument for acquieſcing in the unintelligible myſteries of theology. The authority of the church was alſo brought in to ſilence all cavils from the quarter of impertinent reaſoning. "There are myſteries," ſays Gregory of Nazianzum, "in all nature, and in the "mind of man. If, you who enquire con- "cerning thoſe things do not underſtand "yourſelf; if you do not underſtand thoſe "things which you can examine with your "ſenſes, how can you underſtand God, what, "and how great he is. This is great folly *."

"Some tenets in the church," ſays Baſil, "we receive as preſerved in writing, but "ſome are of apoſtolical tradition, hand- "ed down as *myſteries*; both of which have "the ſame force with reſpect to piety; and "no one will queſtion them who is at all ac- "quainted with the laws of the church †."

Auſtin alſo, who wrote in a later period, pleaded for implicit faith on the authority of

* Or. xxix. Opera, p. 493.

† De Sp. S. Cap. 27. Opera Vol. ii. p. 350.

the

the prophet Iſaiah. "It was, therefore," he ſays, "rationally ſaid by the prophet (ch. vi.) "*Unleſs ye believe ye will not underſtand*; "where he doubtleſs diſtinguiſhes theſe two "things, and adviſes that we firſt *believe*, that "we may be able to *underſtand* what we be- "lieve; ſo that it ſeems reaſonable that faith "ſhould precede reaſon *." It is obvious, however, to conclude, that it could only be ſome great abſurdity in doctrine that could lead men to have recourſe to ſo manifeſt an abſurdity in the mode of defending it. For nothing can be more palpably ſo, than to require that a *belief* of any propoſition ſhould precede, and not follow (as in all caſes it neceſſarily muſt) the *underſtanding* of it. What would any perſon, unacquainted with Greek, ſay to my requiring his aſſent to any propoſition expreſſed in that language. Would he not reply, that he could not poſſibly tell whether my propoſition was true or falſe, till he underſtood the meaning of it. Now it is evident that phraſes and propoſitions, in a known language, which convey no diſtinct ideas, are the very ſame in this reſpect as if they had been the words of an unknown tongue.

* Epiſt. 222. Opera Vol. 2. p. 859.

SECT.

SECTION IV.

Tranſactions in the Weſt till the Death of Valentinian, A. D. 375.

HAVING ſeen what was doing in the Eaſt, let us now turn our eyes towards the Weſt, where Valentinian governed. And it is ſomething remarkable that as, after the death of Conſtantine, the Weſtern emperors were of the Nicene faith, when the emperor of the Eaſt was an Arian, ſo it happened now. But Valentinian, though a zealous chriſtian, and of a religious perſuaſion different from that of his brother, did not interfere as he did in eccleſiaſtical matters; but for the moſt part very wiſely left the biſhops to conduct their own affairs as they pleaſed *.

The Weſt was not, however, altogether free from the effects of clerical ambition and faction; for upon the death of Liberius, A. D. 356, Damaſus being choſen in his place, Urſinus, a deacon, got himſelf elected, and formed a ſeparate congregation; and ſome

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. vi. Cap. 21. p. 245.

of

of the citizens taking part with one of the biſhops, and ſome with the other, and both ſides having recourſe to arms, ſeveral perſons were killed. But at length the præfect of the city put an end to the ſedition by fixing Damaſus in the ſee *.

The only biſhop of eminence in the Weſt who eſpouſed the Arian doctrine at this time, was Auxentius of Milan, who with a few others, held that the Son was of a nature different from that of the Father, being Eunomians. Some attempts were alſo made to promote this doctrine in Gaul, on which account a ſynod was aſſembled at Rome, conſiſting of biſhops from many provinces, when Auxentius and his party were excommunicated, the Nicene faith was confirmed, and the creed of Ariminum condemned †.

Auxentius being depoſed, the ſynod requeſted that the emperor himſelf would appoint a perſon to ſucceed him. But he very handſomely declined it, and ſome of the people wiſhing for an Arian biſhop, and others an orthodox one, and a dangerous ſedition being apprehended in conſequence of it, Ambroſe who was then the civil governor of the pro-

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. vi. Cap. 23. p. 245. Socratis Hiſt. Lib. iv. Cap. 29. p. 251.

† Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. vi. Cap. 23. p. 246.

vince, went into the church to prevent it; and being a man univerſally eſteemed, they all with one voice cried that *he* ſhould be their biſhop, though he had not even been baptized.

He was very far from being deſirous of this office, and for ſome time reſolutely refuſed it; but the emperor approving of the nomination, he conſented, and was preſently baptized and ordained. Ambroſe was a man of ſingular integrity and courage; and this he ſoon ſhewed, by reproving ſome of the magiſtrates in the preſence of the emperor himſelf, who was ſo far from being offended, that when it was complained of, he ſaid he knew what he himſelf had to expect from his freedom *.

Ambroſe was a ſtrenuous defender of the Nicene faith, and appears in his writings to have carried the doctrine of the trinity as high in the Weſt as Baſil and the two Gregories did in the Eaſt. The famous Auſtin was his diſciple, and adopted his ſentiments in moſt things.

Valentinian hearing of the controverſies in the Eaſt, and with the concurrence of his bro-

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. iv. Cap. 30. p. 252. Theod. Lib. iv. Cap. 7. p. 153. Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. vi. Cap. 24. p. 248.

ther

ther (and as Theodoret ſays before he became an Arian, a change which he aſcribes to the influence of his wife and of Eudoxius *) called a council in Illyricum; and the biſhops aſſembled there confirmed the Nicene faith. No new creed was compoſed upon this occaſion, but a ſynodical letter was addreſſed to the biſhops of Aſia, Phrygia, Carophrygia, and Pacatiana, which had probably been the principal ſeat of the controverſies which occaſioned the calling of the ſynod. In this letter the members of the council, without entering into any argument, ſtrongly aſſert the neceſſity of holding the Holy Spirit to be conſubſtantial with the Father and the Son, and anathematize thoſe who maintained the contrary doctrine. They moreover ſay that the kingdom of heaven is prepared for thoſe who believed as they did in this reſpect, but nothing is here ſaid of the *equality* of the perſons in the conſubſtantial trinity.

Both the emperors joined in enforcing the decrees of this council, which was held on the confines of both their territories, and they both joined in a letter to the biſhops of the ſame provinces to which the ſynodical epiſtle had been ſent. In this letter the emperors

* Lib. iv. Cap. 12. p. 163.

reaſoned

reaſoned much more on the ſubject than the biſhops had done, particularly explaining the ſenſe in which the term *conſubſtantial* was to be underſtood; and it is obſervable that, as they explain it, it might be applied to any *creature*, ſo that both the parties might agree in the ſame ſubſcription; but it would only be in words, nothing in reality being decided by it*.

While the council was aſſembled at Illyricum, they received an epiſtle from Damaſus biſhop of Rome, and the other biſhops who had depoſed Auxentius, exhorting them to continue firm in the Nicene faith, and expreſſing their hope that this would ſoon become univerſal, as thoſe who had been deceived at Ariminum had preſently after repented of their compliance†.

Eccleſiaſtical hiſtory ſays nothing farther concerning Valentinian, who died ſuddenly, A. D. 375, after giving vent to his indignation in a ſpeech to the Sarmatian ambaſſadors, in the fifty fifth year of his age, and the fourteenth of his reign. He was ſucceeded by his two ſons, Gratian, whom he had raiſed to the purple A. D. 367, and Valentinian the

* Theod. Hiſt Lib. iv. Cap. 8, 9. p. 154, &c.
† Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. vi. Cap. 23. p. 246.

ſecond,

ſecond, whom the army proclaimed emperor immediately on his death, though he was then but a child *.

SECTION V.

From the Death of Valentinian, A. D. 375, to that of Valens A. D. 379, containing an Account of the Controverſy concerning the Holy Spirit, the Opinions of Apollinaris, and the Divinations of ſome Heathen Philoſophers, with a View to find who ſhould be the next Emperor.

TOWARDS the end of the reign of Valens, who ſurvived his brother four years, the controverſy about the Holy Spirit, which had begun ſome time before, was much agitated, almoſt as much as that concerning the conſubſtantiality of the Son had ever been; and on this queſtion both the ſects of the Arians, viz. thoſe who held that the Son was of a ſubſtance *like*, and thoſe who held that it was *unlike*, that of the Father, agreed. For both conſidered the Holy Spirit, either as the Spirit or power of God the Father,

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. iv. Cap. 31. p. 253.

and therefore not *a perſon* diſtinct from him, or an intelligent being below the Son in rank, and of a ſubſtance unlike that of the Father. But all thoſe who thought the Son to be of the ſame ſubſtance with the Father thought the ſame with reſpect to the Holy Spirit. This, however, had not always been the caſe, as is evident with reſpect to Euſebius the hiſtorian, who held that the Holy Spirit was created by the Son, which was alſo the opinion of all before the council of Nice, who thought the Holy Spirit to be a perſon.

The great defenders of the conſubſtantiality of the Holy Spirit after Athanaſius, who appeared in this controverſy a little before his death, were Apollinaris of Laodicea, Baſil of Cæſarea, and Gregory of Nazianzum. But according to Sozomen the letter which I have mentioned from the biſhop of Rome contributed very much to eſtabliſh the doctrine of the conſubſtantiality of the Spirit in the Eaſt*. It is evident, however, from the letters of Baſil, that the doctrine of the divinity of the Spirit was very unpopular in all his dioceſe, and in the Eaſt in general; and that there were many more unitarians in thoſe countries than any hiſtorians ſpeak of.

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. vi. Cap. 22. p. 245.

About

About this time the two Apollinaris's, father and ſon, the ſame who had diſtinguiſhed themſelves by their ingenious compoſitions to ſupply the place of thoſe Greek claſſics, which Julian did not permit to be read by chriſtians, diſtinguiſhed themſelves much more by a ſchiſm which they made in the church, maintaining, as I have mentioned before, that the logos ſupplied the place of a human ſoul in the perſon of Chriſt. Apollinaris the father was originally of Egypt, and firſt opened a ſchool of grammar at Berytus, afterwards he removed to Laodicea, where he married, and had this ſon, who became a teacher of rhetoric in the ſame city. Being very intimate with Epiphanius the heathen ſophiſt, and not liſtening to the admonitions of George the biſhop of the place, to refrain from his ſociety, they were excommunicated by him; and upon this they began to form ſeparate congregations, teaching the doctrine above-mentioned *.

Sozomen adds that both the father and the ſon had given offence to the biſhops of Laodicea, who were Arians, by their attachment to Athanaſius, and that they greatly promoted the intereſt of their party by the numerous

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. ii. Cap. 46. p. 163.

hymns which they compoſed to be ſung by perſons of all conditions, and in all ſituations. Their opinion was much oppoſed at this time by Damaſus biſhop of Rome, and alſo by Peter biſhop of Alexandria. But we ſhall find more public notice taken of it hereafter*.

According to Gregory of Nazianzum, Apollinaris held two other doctrines, which gave great offence to the orthodox. One of them was that the *fleſh* which the logos aſſumed was what he brought from Heaven, and that he did not take it of the Virgin. The other opinion was, that *the logos ſuffered* along with the body to which it was united, that it even died, and was raiſed from the dead by the power of the Father, an opinion which we ſhall find adopted by Eutyches, in a later period. In ſupport of the former of theſe opinions Apollinaris alleged the words of the evangeliſt John iii. 13. *No man hath aſcended up into Heaven, but the ſon of man who is in Heaven*; and alſo that of the apoſtle Paul, 1ſt Cor. xv. 17. *the ſecond man is the Lord from Heaven*†. But as no controverſial work of Apollinaris is now extant, it is not eaſy to ſay what his opinions really were, or how he defended them.

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. vi. Cap. 25. p. 250.

† Ibid. Cap. 27. p. 254.

About

About this time the followers of Eunomius, if not Eunomius himſelf, greatly alarmed the chriſtian world by their innovation, as it was called, in the adminiſtration of baptiſm. For, in imitation of the Paulians, or Unitarians, they no longer baptized in the name of the *Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit*, but into *the death of Chriſt*, probably founding their practice on the words of the apoſtle Paul, Romans vi. 3. *Know ye not, that ſo many of us as were baptized into Jeſus Chriſt, were baptized into his death*, and thinking that the commom form of baptiſm favoured the doctrine of the trinity. This practice gave the greater alarm, as, according to Sozomen, it was agreed by all parties (though I ſhould doubt this with reſpect to the Eunomians) that they who had not been regularly baptized themſelves could not confer a regular baptiſm on others.

The Eunomians, this writer acknowledges, were in general men of abilities, and excelled in argumentation. He alſo owns that many perſons were pleaſed with the gravity and ſeverity of diſcipline in the Eunomian churches. They would have drawn many more, he ſays, into their opinions, if they

had not been oppoſed by Bazil and Gregory of Nazianzum, and if the emperor Theodoſius had not baniſhed them from the more agreeable parts of the Roman empire, to thoſe that were deſart and barbarous *.

Sozomen ſays that, beſides theſe cauſes of the ſuppreſſion of the Eunomian and Apollinarian hereſies, the monks contributed not a little to it; for that all thoſe of Syria, Cappadocia, and the neighbouring provinces adhered cloſely to the Nicene faith. Otherwiſe, he ſays, that all the provinces of the Eaſt from Cilicia to Phænicia, would have embraced the Apollinarian hereſy; and that the Eunomians were in poſſeſſion of all the country from Cilicia and Mount Taurus to Conſtantinople. But the common people, holding the monks in great veneration, were eaſily brought to think that the doctrines which they eſpouſed were right. In like manner the Egyptians ceaſed to be Arians by adopting the opinions of the monks in their country. Our author then proceeds to give a long account of the more celebrated monks who flouriſhed at this time in Egypt, Thebais, Scetis, Nitria, Rhinocorura, Paleſtine, Syria,

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. vi. Cap. 26. p. 253.

ria, Cœleſyria, Edeſſa, Galatia, Cappadocia, and other countries*.

Many of the Goths were brought to embrace chriſtianity in the reign of Valens, in conſequence of his aſſiſting one party of them againſt the other; the prince whoſe part he took embracing the religion of his protector, and recommending it to his ſubjects. For this reaſon alſo theſe chriſtian Goths were Arians, Valens himſelf being ſo. The other branch of the Goths, however, continuing heathens, perſecuted the chriſtians, ſo that many of the Gothic Arians became martyrs†.

Many of the Saracens are alſo ſaid to have embraced chriſtianity in the latter part of the reign of Valens; and Mavia, a queen among them, agreed to make peace with the Romans, whoſe territories ſhe had greatly ravaged, on condition that one Moſes, a monk, might be permitted to go and ſettle as a biſhop among her ſubjects‡.

The heathen philoſophers were much mortified at the firm eſtabliſhment which chriſtianity had acquired in the reign of Valens,

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. vi. Cap. 27, 28. p. 55, &c.
† Socratis Hiſt. Lib. iv. Cap. 33. p. 255.
‡ Socratis Hiſt. Lib. iv. Cap. 36. p. 257. Theod. Hiſt. Lib. iv. Cap. 23. p. 182.

and earneſtly wiſhed for another heathen emperor, ſuch as Julian had been. And as the heathens in general, the philoſophers themſelves by no means excepted, had great faith in divination, a number of them aſſembled towards the cloſe of this reign, to find out by this art who was to ſucceed Valens.

For this purpoſe, as the proceſs is deſcribed by Ammianus Marcellinus, a heathen hiſtorian, a tripod of laurel was artificially prepared, and conſecrated with certain preſcribed ſecret charms and invocations. It was then placed in the middle of a room, perfumed with Arabian ſpices. The diſh, made of different metals, upon which it was ſet, had upon its utmoſt brim the twenty-four letters of the alphabet, neatly engraved, at due diſtances from each other. Then a perſon cloathed in linen veſtments, with linen ſocs upon his feet, and a ſuitable covering upon his head, came in with laurel branches in his hands; and after performing ſome myſtic charms, ſhook a ring ſuſpended from a rod, about the edge of the diſh, which, jumping up and down, reſted on certain letters of the alphabet; the prieſt at the ſame time uttering certain heroic verſes, in anſwer to the queſtions which had been propoſed.

The

The letters which the ring pointed out in this caſe were four, viz. ΘΕΟΔ, which being put together compoſed theſe two ſyllables, Theod, on which one who ſtood by preſently cried out that the oracle plainly intended *Theodorus*. Nor did they make any farther enquiries, being all well ſatisfied that he was the perſon intended *.

This Theodorus was a military officer in the emperor's houſhold, and a man of excellent character, though a heathen; and an earneſt wiſh that he ſhould ſucceed Valens, with an expectation that the divulging of this oracle, at a proper time, would greatly facilitate their ſcheme, would probably lead them to impoſe upon themſelves, as well as others, by this mode of inquiry.

Theſe proceedings were, no doubt, intended to be kept ſecret, but Valens was informed of them; and perhaps not being himſelf free from ſuperſtition, as thinking that dæmons might ſometimes be permitted to do very extraordinary things (which indeed was the general opinion of chriſtians in this age) he conſidered it as an act of treaſon; and being exceedingly alarmed, and enraged, he put to death all who had been concerned in this buſineſs; and not only them, but, as the

* Lardner's Teſtimonies, Vol. iv. p. 355.

chriſtian

chriſtian hiſtorians ſay, many other perſons in different parts of the empire, whoſe names began with the four unfortunate letters THEOD, as Theodotus, Theodoſius, Theodulus, &c. But as the heathen hiſtorians make no mention of a thing ſo unreaſonable and cruel, Dr. Lardner thinks it undeſerving of any credit.

Theodorus, whom the heathens wiſhed to have for an emperor, and whom Ammianus Marcellinus acknowledges to have formed ſome deſigns upon the empire (though it does not appear that he had any concern in this buſineſs, and probably had no other wiſh than that of ſucceeding Valens after his death) was beheaded. Of the diviners themſelves, Simonides, a young man, was burned alive, and the philoſopher Maximus, the great friend of Julian, who had been conſulted upon the occaſion, and who had diſapproved of their proceedings, as an hazardous thing, was beheaded, becauſe he had given no information of it. But what the orthodox hiſtorians, probably to blacken the character of Valens, farther add, of his putting to death all the heathen philoſophers throughout the empire, and even thoſe who, without being philoſophers, had choſen to wear their peculiar habit (ſo that

that from this time we hear little or nothing of them) is in the higheſt degree improbable; and the heathen writers ſay nothing of any ſuch perſecution *.

As to the deficiency of heathen philoſophers, which is not denied, it may be accounted for from the decline of heatheniſm in general, and the prevalence of chriſtianity. I would obſerve, however, on this occaſion, that a much more grievous perſecution than this of the heathens by Valens, even admitting the moſt exaggerated account of it, was ſo far from extinguiſhing, that it even materially contributed to the ſpread of, chriſtianity. Beſides, as it is not ſaid that any of theſe philoſphers had the option of eſcaping death by becoming chriſtians, they cannot be ſaid to have died proper *martyrs* to their religion, though they ſhould have been put to death in conſequence of having made profeſſion of it.

At length Valens died as ſuddenly as his brother, and much more miſerably A. D. 379. For after being defeated in a battle with the barbarians in Thrace, he was burnt, along with his attendants, in a village to which he had fled, and to which the enemy had ſet fire.

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. vi. Cap. 35. p. 269. Socratis Hiſt. Lib. iv. Cap. 19. p. 234.

He had lived fifty years, and had reigned thirteen along with his brother, and three more after his death*.

Of both theſe princes Mr. Gibbon ſays, that "they invariably retained in the purple "the chaſte and temperate ſimplicity which "had adorned their private life; and under "their reign the pleaſures of a court never "coſt the people a bluſh or a ſigh. They "gradually reformed many of the abuſes of "the times of Conſtantius, judiciouſly adopt-"ed and improved the deſigns of Julian and "his ſucceſſor, and diſplayed a ſtyle and ſpirit "of legiſlation which might inſpire poſterity "with the moſt favourable opinion of their "character and government." Though it is ſaid that they were in a great meaſure illiterate themſelves, they were great promoters of learning. They planned a courſe of inſtructions for every city in the empire, and the academies of Rome and Conſtantinople were conſiderably extenſive, eſpecially the latter*. With reſpect to ability it is acknowledged that Valens was greatly inferior to his brother.

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. iv. Cap. 38. p. 259. Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. vi. Cap. 40. p. 278.

† Hiſt. Vol. ii. p. 502.

SECT.

SECTION VI.

State of Sects in this Period.

VALENS was the only proper Arian emperor, as he adopted the tenets of Eunomius, at leaſt always favoured that party, and though it is not credible that he ſhould have been guilty of the horrid cruelties which the orthodox hiſtorians lay to his charge, the meaſures which he took to extirpate what he thought to be hereſy, though the ſame with thoſe which had been adopted by Conſtantine and Conſtantius before him, were far from being juſtifiable. With reſpect to the heathens, Theodoret ſays, that he had allowed them to worſhip in their own way, and waged war with none but thoſe who held the apoſtolical (by which he meant the Homoouſian) doctrine. During the whole time of that reign the fire burned upon the altars, the Gentiles offered incenſe and ſacrifices to their idols, and held their feaſts publicly in the market places. They who were initated in the rites of Bacchus ran about covered with goat

goat ſkins, and tearing dogs to pieces, with that wild fury, which was uſual in the ſolemnities of that God*.

In this reign both the Arian and the Trinitarian doctrine were much advanced, the Arians in general being Eunomians, maintained that Chriſt was properly *a creature*, and of a ſubſtance *unlike* that of the Father; and the Trinitarians avowing, what they had not done before, that all the three perſons in the trinity were not only *conſubſtantial*, but likewiſe in all reſpects perfectly *equal*, though this doctrine had not as yet acquired the ſanction of any council.

I. *Of the Unitarians.*

No mention is made by hiſtorians of any Unitarians in this reign. But after being ſo numerous not long before, it cannot be ſuppoſed that no ſuch chriſtians exiſted. It is probable that ſome of them, under the name of Paulians, or Photinians, held ſeparate aſſemblies, and that a great number of the common people, who were unitarians, continued in communion with the catholic church, in which no ſubſcription was required of them,

* Lardner's Teſtimonies, Vol. iv. p. 368.

and

and no trinitarian liturgies were then uſed. The caſual mention of them by Athanaſius and others, is a ſufficient proof of their exiſtence, and that they were numerous, eſpecially among the lower people, whoſe behaviour was pacific, and who were beneath the notice of ſolemn councils. It is of them that Athanaſius ſpeaks, when he ſays, "It "grieves thoſe who ſtand up for the holy "faith, that *the multitude*, and eſpecially per-"ſons of low underſtanding, ſhould be in-"fected with thoſe blaſphemies. Things "that are ſublime and difficult" (in which light the pre-exiſtence and divinity of Chriſt were always exhibited by the ancients) "are "not to be apprehended except by faith, and "ignorant people muſt fall if they cannot be "perſuaded to reſt in faith, and avoid curious "queſtions *."

We ſee by this how much even the learned of that age were puzzled with ſuch queſtions as plain people ſometimes put to them about their new and myſterious doctrines, and that they could not reconcile them to what is ſo plainly taught, and ſo copiouſly and forcibly inculcated, in the ſcriptures, concerning *one*

* De incarnatione verbi contra Paulum Samoſatenſem, Opera Vol. i. 591.

God,

God, and the ſubordination of Chriſt, and of all other prophets, to him.

We even ſee in a period much later than this, viz. the reign of Juſtinian, that Facundus calls the unitarians the *Grex fidelium*, the *common herd of believers*, of whom he ſays that they were *imperfect* in the faith, reſembling the whole chriſtian church in the time of our Saviour, and till the publication of the goſpel of John, when it was acknowledged that chriſtians in general had not attained to more knowledge than that of the humanity of Chriſt, and were ignorant of his pre-exiſtence and divinity. It may alſo be collected from Epiphanius, that the unitarians, under more denominations than one, were numerous in his time, as they muſt have been in Africa when Auſtin wrote; ſince many things that he advances are pointed againſt them.

II. *Of the Novatians.*

Valens, in his zeal for Arianiſm, baniſhed from Conſtantinople the Novatians, who were Conſubſtantialiſts, and ſhut up their churches. He even baniſhed their biſhop Agelius, a man, ſays Socrates, of an apoſtolical character, who uſually walked barefoot, and

and in a ſimple tunic. But his anger was ſoftened by Macrianus, a man of religion and addreſs, who had inſtructed two daughters of Valens in the art of grammar, and who had held a conſiderable rank in the army near the emperor's perſon (having probably been of the prætorian guards) but was now a preſbyter among the Novatians. Out of reſpect to him the churches of the Novatians were again opened *.

The Novatians about this time made a change with reſpect to the celebration of Eaſter, for which it is not eaſy to aſſign a reaſon; ſince both Novatus himſelf, and all his followers, in every part of the world, had not before made any difficulty of keeping this feſtival as it had been ſettled by the council of Nice. But now, in a ſynod held at Pagus in Phrygia, ſome of the Novatians agreed to celebrate this feſtival at the ſame time with the Jews. This, Socrates ſays, he had from an old man, the ſon of a preſbyter, and who, together with his father, were preſent at this ſynod, though neither Agelius the Novatian biſhop of Conſtantinople, nor Maximus of Nice, nor thoſe of Nicomedia or Cottuæum, were there; and theſe were generally

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. iv. Cap. 9. p. 221.

conſidered as at the head of the ſect. On account of this ſynod, however, the Novatians were afterwards divided into two parties *.

III. *Of the Donatiſts.*

It is not a little extraordinary that ſuch people as the catholics repreſent the Donatiſts to have been, viz. more like heathens than chriſtians, indeed more like brutes than men; they ſhould, notwithſtanding all meaſures, whether of gentleneſs or rigour, continue to increaſe, ſo that, without the aid of civil power, the Catholics were not able to make head againſt them.

Valentinian was no more ſparing of *wholeſome ſeverity*, as in that age it was deemed to be, than any of his predeceſſors. One law of his is particularly levelled againſt them and the Manichæans, by which they were declared to be incapable of receiving any public bounty, of making a teſtament, or diſpoſing of their goods; ſome were made incapable of inheriting the eſtates of their fathers, and

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. iv. Cap. 28. p. 249. Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. vi. Cap. 24. p. 249.

the

the ſlave of a Donatiſt, forſaking his maſter, obtained his liberty.

Yet under all theſe diſcouragements it is acknowledged that the Donatiſts were exceedingly numerous, and divided among themſelves, and their cruelties to each other are ſaid not to have fallen ſhort of thoſe which they exerciſed againſt the catholics; Donatus biſhop of Bagnia was, in a tumult, thrown into a well, and in another place Marculus was thrown from a high rock. Theſe, and other ſhocking particulars, are collected by Dr. Long from the writings of Auſtin*.

In this reign the Donatiſts held a council at Carthage, where Parmenian was their biſhop, in which Ticonius, who was at the head of a party which ſeparated from Donatus, and which this council did not put an end to, attended. This Ticonius had given offence to the other Donatiſts by his writings, by which he endeavoured to extend the ſect of the Donatiſts beyond the limits of Africa. About this time, alſo, Parmenian wrote againſt the catholics, and was anſwered by Optatus biſhop of Milevi, who gives an account of the origin of the Donatiſts, and deſcribes their cuſtoms. But the enormities which he attributes to them

* Hiſtory of the Donatiſts, p. 77, &c.

are not credible with reſpect to any people profeſſing chriſtianity. Parmenian had propoſed a public conference with the catholic biſhops, but he afterwards declined it, alleging that he ſhould be defiled by communication with the impure *.

SECTION VII.

Of the Conteſt for the See of Rome after the Death of Liberius, and the Corruption of the Clergy in the City.

IN this period of my hiſtory we have the firſt remarkable inſtance of the degree to which the wealth and power annexed to the ſee of Rome could inflame the paſſions of men.

On the death of Liberius, A. D. 366, there appeared to be two parties in the church of Rome, the remains, it is ſaid, of thoſe who had favoured *him*, and of thoſe who had taken the part of Felix. One of theſe declared for Damaſus, who was a native of Spain, and had been attached to Liberius, and the

* Le Sueur Hiſt. A. D. 368

other

other for Urſicinus. The partiſans of each meeting in different churches, they were both elected at the ſame time, and the people entered ſo warmly into the conteſt, that Juventius the præfect thought it neceſſary to interpoſe; and, taking the part of Damaſus, he ſent Urſicinus and his principal adherents into exile. His friends, however, reſcued him from the præfect, and conducted him to a church, which the party of Damaſus ſoon beſet; and forcing the doors, unroofing the building, and ſetting fire to it, one hundred and thirty perſons of both ſexes were killed. Urſicinus and his adherents fled, and thus Damaſus was eſtabliſhed by force.

The partiſans of Urſicinus, however, did not ceaſe importuning Valentinian till they obtained an order for their return to the city. But by the influence of Damaſus, he was once more expelled, and with many of his adherents he went into Gaul. Others of his friends took poſſeſſion of a church in the city, and held it till it was taken from them by the civil power*.

Ammianus Marcellinus, who gives an account of this ſedition, obſerves with reſpect to it, that when he conſiders the ſplendour of

* Hiſtoire des Papes, Vol. i. p. 223, &c.

the city, he does not wonder that the poſſeſſion of this ſee was ſo eagerly contended for; as the ſucceſsful candidates were ſure to be enriched by the oblations of the matrons, they rode richly habited in chariots, and the luxury of their tables exceeded that of kings. "They would be truly happy," he adds, "if, deſpiſing the magnificence of the city, "they would imitate ſome of the biſhops of "provincial towns, whoſe temperance in eat-"ing and drinking, plainneſs of apparel, "and looking above the world, recommend-"ed them to the Deity and his true worſhip-"pers *." This is an excellent remark of a heathen, who thus bears teſtimony to the virtues of thoſe biſhops who were removed from ſuch great temptations as the opulence of Rome and the greater ſees afforded. And in general even thoſe greater biſhops were men of virtue.

We ſee traces of the corruption of ſome of the chriſtian clergy of this period, in a law of Valentinian, by which thoſe who were called *Continentes* were forbidden to enter the houſes of widows and minors, or to take any thing of them, or in any manner whatever from women to whom they ſhould have attached

* Lib. 27. p. 362.

themſelves

themſelves on pretence of religion. By this law whatever was given them in this way was to be confiſcated. Jerom mentions this law, confeſſing its reaſonableneſs, but lamenting the occaſion of it.

"It is a ſhame," he ſays, "that players, "charioteers and courteſans, ſhould not be "excluded from inheritances, and the clergy "and monks ſhould be prohibited to receive "them; and this not by perſecutors, but by "chriſtian princes. I do not," ſays he, "complain of the law, but grieve that there "ſhould have been occaſion for it. The cau-"tery is proper, but how came the wound "which required it*."

SECTION VIII.

Of the Council of Laodicea.

IT was in this reign, probably A. D. 364, that the council of Laodicea, conſiſting of about thirty biſhops, was held; a council famous for fixing the preſent canon of the books of ſcripture, as well as many things relating to church diſcipline.

* Epiſt. 2. ad Nepotianum Opera Vol. 1. p. 11.

It appears by the acts of his council, that many perſons ſtill continued to celebrate Eaſter on the fourteenth day of the month, according to the cuſtom of the Jews with reſpect to their paſſover. Alſo the Agapes, or love feaſts, had continued in ſome churches, as they were now expreſſly forbidden.

In this council the invocation of angels is condemned as idolatrous. This cuſtom, which is alluded to by the apoſtle Paul, Col. ii. 18. Theodoret ſays, continued long in Phrygia and Piſidia; and that therefore it was condemned at this ſynod which was held in Phrygia. Still, however, he ſays there may be ſeen in that country, and others contiguous to it, oratories of St. Michael. Theſe people, he ſays, worſhipped in this manner out of humility, thinking the ſupreme Being to be inacceſſible to them, but that he might be rendered propitious by the mediation of angels*. Little was it then foreſeen to what a height this ſpecies of idolatry would ariſe in a later period, and that the number of chriſtian *mediators with God* would in time exceed that of the heathen deities, that this worſhip would be carried on in the ſame forms, and would engroſs almoſt all the devotion of the chriſtian world. We have had examples of per-

* Opera Vol. iii. p. 355.

ſons

ſons requeſting the prayers of martyrs, when they ſhould be in heaven, but thoſe requeſts were made to them before they died. As yet we have had no example of any addreſs made to them after they were dead. About this time, however, it was the cuſtom of ſome women to offer cakes on certain days to the virgin Mary, from which they got the name of *Collyridians*, a cuſtom which Epiphanius ſays prevailed in Arabia, but originated in Thrace, and the upper Scythia. But this cuſtom did not extend far, and was generally condemned*.

By the decrees of this council we perceive that the faſt which preceded the celebration of Eaſter was much extended, ſo as to take in three weeks. So ſtrict was this faſt, that by this council the adminiſtration of the euchariſt was forbidden in it, as alſo the anniverſaries of the martyrs, except on Saturdays and Sundays, becauſe theſe days were always conſidered as feſtivals: for the ſame reaſon marriages were alſo forbidden during this faſt†.

* Hær. 79. Opera, Vol. i. p. 1057.
† Binnii Concilia, Vol. i. p. 241.

SEC-

SECTION IX.

Of the Writers in the Time of Valens.

ONE of the principal writers, as well as actors, in eccleſiaſtical matters from the time of Conſtantine, to that of Valens (for in theſe later periods, I do not propoſe to notice them all) was Athanaſius of Alexandria, whoſe hiſtory has been given already. He was by no means what we ſhould now call *a writer by profeſſion*, ſince almoſt every thing that he wrote was on ſome particular occaſion, either in defence of himſelf, or againſt his adverſaries. Conſequently almoſt all his writings relate to the Arian controverſy. We have, however, beſides his writings of this claſs, a work of his againſt the Gentiles, and the life of the monk Anthony, to whom he was particularly attached; a work which, like other lives of monks, bears the marks of great credulity and ſuperſtition.

There were ſeveral hermits of the name of Macarius, and it is uncertain to which of them we owe the tracts which are come down

to

to us under this name; but there are fifty homilies addreſſed to the monks, and rules for a monaſtic life.

Of Hilary biſhop of Poitiers much hath been ſaid in the preceding hiſtory. He was a ſtrenuous defender of the doctrine of the trinity, on which ſubject we have a large treatiſe of his in twelve books. He alſo wrote a treatiſe on ſynods, and ſome commentaries on the ſcriptures. Beſides theſe, we have ſome fragments of his collected by another perſon, and which are of great uſe with reſpect to the hiſtory of thoſe times.

Notwithſtanding the numerous writings of Apollinaris, nothing now remains of his beſides a tranſlation of the pſalms into verſe. The works relating to his particular opinions are all loſt; and on this occaſion Dupin ſays, that the Catholics had ſo great a horror of the books of heretics, that they would not preſerve even thoſe of them which did not relate to their hereſy, and which might have been uſeful to the church.

Cyril of Jeruſalem has left a number of catechetical, and alſo of myſtigogical lectures, the former addreſſed to catechumens, and the other to perſons lately baptized.

We have a Greek tranſlation of the works of Ephrem the Syrian, a deacon of Edeſſa,

conſiſting of moral diſcourſes. They were ſo much admired as to be read in many churches after the ſcriptures. This writer was born in the reign of Conſtantine. He very early embraced the monaſtic life, and was much eſteemed by Baſil.

Baſil, ſurnamed *the great*, of whom an account was given in the preceding hiſtory, was one of the moſt conſiderable writers of his age. We have of his a treatiſe on the work of the ſix days, thirty one homilies on other ſubjects; two books on baptiſm, a commentary on the firſt ſixteeen chapters of Iſaiah, five books againſt Eunomius, and of monaſtic conſtitutions. But the moſt curious and valuable of his remains are about four hundred *letters*, which give us a clear idea of the hiſtory of his times; on which account Dupin propoſed to give a tranſlation of them into French. It is indeed very much to be wiſhed that there were tranſlations of them into the modern languages.

His brother Gregory of Nyſſa wrote on ſubjects ſimilar to thoſe of Baſil, viz. ſeveral pieces relating to the doctrine of the trinity againſt Eunomius, on the work of the ſix days, and many miſcellaneous tracts.

Gregory of Nazianzum, the great friend of Baſil, diſtinguiſhed himſelf ſo much by his writings

writings on the ſubject of the trinity, that he got the name of *Theologus*. He alſo wrote againſt Julian, by which means many fragments of the work of that emperor againſt chriſtianity have been preſerved, and ſeveral miſcellaneous tracts.

Epiphanius, a native of Paleſtine, and biſhop of Salamis in Crete, of whom ſome mention will be made in the next reign, in which he died at a very advanced age, was the author of many works, the principal of which are ſtill extant, viz. *Ancoratus*, or a diſcourſe concerning faith againſt the Macedonians, on weights and meaſures, a large work againſt hereſies, and an epitome of the ſame. Of theſe he enumerates not leſs than eighty. Though he is in many reſpects a credulous writer, this work of his is upon the whole very valuable.

To this period I muſt refer the ſpurious work which bears the title of *Apoſtolical Conſtitutions*, drawn up in the name of the apoſtles, who are repreſented as employing Clement for their ſecretary. They are firſt quoted by Epiphanius, and are of uſe to give us an idea of the opinions, but ſtill more of the practices, which prevailed in what was called the catholic church of this period.

PERIOD

PERIOD XI.

FROM THE DEATH OF VALENS, A. D. 378, TO THAT OF THEODOSIUS, A. D. 395.

SECTION I.

Of the State of Things at the Accession of Theodosius, and his Determination in Favour of what was deemed the Orthodox Faith.

WE are now come to a reign very similar to that of Constantine, viz. that of an emperor who, like him, was successful in war, zealous for the christian religion, and who employed all his power to support what he held to be the orthodox part of it. It is to his interference that we owe the present general reception of the doctrine of the trinity, and its having ever since made a part of all the civil establishments of christianity. Socrates, in his introduction to the history of this reign, says that from the time that the emperors became

came chriſtians, eccleſiaſtical matters were regulated by them, and that the greateſt councils decided according to their pleaſure*. This, indeed, is ſufficiently evident from the plaineſt facts, without the explicit confeſſion of this honeſt hiſtorian.

The emperor that I refer to was *Theodoſius*, deſcended from an honourable family in Spain (like Conſtantine, often ſurnamed *the great*) who upon the death of Valens was raiſed to the empire by Gratian, from the opinion that he had of his merit, without regard to any other conſideration; an opinion which his able and upright conduct abundantly juſtified. To him Gratian aſſigned the government of the Eaſt, while he retained that of the Weſt, or rather a part of it, viz. Britain, Gaul, and Spain; leaving to his younger brother Valentinian II. the government of Italy, Illyricum, and Africa.

Before the arrival of Theodoſius, the care of the whole empire devolved upon Gratian, who to his other virtues added thoſe of a very good commander. Had Valens waited till he had come to his aſſiſtance, when he was haſtning to join him, it is probable that he would not have met with his unhappy fate, which

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. v. p. 263.

threw

threw Conſtantinople itſelf into the greateſt conſternation. The Goths, however, were repulſed by a vigorous effort of the inhabitants, aided by the Saracens under the queen Mavia mentioned before. And Gratian ſoon after concluded a peace with them.

At the ſame time Gratian reſtored to their ſees all the biſhops who had been baniſhed by Valens, and gave liberty to all ſects of chriſtians; but as he excepted the Manichæans, Photinians, and Eunomians, none but the Novatians, and the more moderate Arians, at that time commonly called Macedonians, could derive any benefit from the toleration*.

At this time the Arians, i. e. the Eunomians, were in poſſeſſion of all the churches of the Eaſt, except that of Jeruſalem, which was under Cyril. But the Macedonians, after their agreement with Liberius and the Conſubſtantialiſts, to which they had been driven by the perſecution of the Eunomians, held no ſeparate aſſemblies till after this law of Gratian. Taking advantage of it, ſome of them recovered the ſees from which they had been expelled; and forming a ſynod at Antioch, they decreed that the Son was not of *the*

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. vii. Cap. 1. p. 279. Socratis Hiſt. Lib. v. Cap. 1, 2. p. 264.

ſame,

ſame, but only of *like* ſubſtance with the Father. Many of their body, however thinking this to be a factious meaſure, quitted their communion, and adhered to that of the Conſubſtantialiſts. Some of the biſhops, who were at liberty by this law of Gratian to return to their ſees, were not ſolicitous about it; but, having experienced the miſchiefs of diſſenſion, were content to live in communion with the churches which they had formerly governed*.

In conſequence of this law of Gratian, Meletius returned to Antioch, and Paulinus being then very old, it was, after much contention, agreed, that the whole church ſhould be governed by the ſurvivor of them; and in the mean time Meletius went to reſide at Conſtantinople†.

Theodoſius, arriving in the Eaſt, was as ſucceſsful in his wars againſt the barbarians as Gratian was in the Weſt. Whether the latter had a view to any other qualifications than thoſe of a ſoldier, a chriſtian, and an honeſt man, is not ſaid; but it ſoon appeared that Theodoſius was as zealous a Conſubſtantialiſt as him-

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. vii. Cap. 2. p. 280. Socratis Hiſt. Lib. v. Cap. 4. p. 265.

† Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. vii. Cap. 3. p. 281. Socratis Hiſt. Lib. vii. Cap. 5. p. 266.

ſelf. In common with Conſtantine, Conſtantius, and other eminent perſons of that age, he had not been baptized; but being taken ill at Theſſalonica, and finding that Aſcholius the biſhop of that city was a Conſubſtantialiſt, he choſe to be baptized by him; and upon his recovery he publiſhed a law to oblige all his ſubjects to profeſs the doctrine of the Nicene creed, and ordered that all the churches in which it was not profeſſed ſhould be conſidered as heretical*. Accordingly, on his arrival at Conſtantinople, he gave Demophilus the Arian biſhop the choice of quitting his profeſſion, or the city; and chuſing the latter, he and his followers aſſembled in a church without the gates. Thus, ſays our hiſtorian, the Arians were expelled from the city of Conſtantinople, after they had kept poſſeſſion of it forty years† He was ſucceeded by Gregory of Nazianzum.

The Homoouſian party, however, were apprehenſive of the influence of the Arians, and eſpecially of Eunomius, on account of his great powers of perſuaſion. For as he lived as a private perſon in Bythinia, many reſorted to him from Conſtantinople; and

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. vii. Cap. 4. p. 282.

† Socratis Hiſt. Lib. v. Cap. 7. p. 268. Sozomen Hiſt. Lib. vii. Cap. 5. p. 283.

the emperor himſelf expreſſed a wiſh to have an interview with him; but he was diverted from his purpoſe by his wife Flaccilla, who dreaded the conſequences of it.

It is ſaid that Theodoſius was confirmed in the trinitarian doctrine, by the addreſs of Amphilochius, an old biſhop, who ſuſpecting him of wavering in his opinion, after ſaluting *him* with all due reſpect as the emperor, behaved with unbecoming freedom to his *ſon*. The emperor being offended at this, the old man ſaid he did it on purpoſe that he might give him ſome idea of the diſpleaſure which their heavenly Father would conceive againſt thoſe who did not worſhip his ſon as they did himſelf*. At this time, however, the emperor's ſon had not the title of *Auguſtus*, and therefore the old biſhop's example was not in point, if his intention was to inculcate the doctrine of the perfect equality of the Son to the Father. This ſtory is referred by Theodoret to a later period in the hiſtory, viz. till after the return of Theodoſius from the defeat of Maximus†. But neither of the ſons of Theodoſius was emperor till after his death.

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. vii. Cap. 6. p. 284.
† Lib. v. Cap. 16. p. 214.

SECTION II.

Of the Council of Conſtantinople A. D. 381.

THE emperor, being now confirmed in his own opinion, called a council, as Sozomen ſays, of the biſhops of his own communion, both to eſtabliſh the decrees of the council of Nice, and to elect a biſhop for the church of Conſtantinople; many perſons having complained of Gregory, the friend of Baſil, as having been brought to them from a diſtance; but many more were, no doubt, diſſatisfied with him on account of his high trinitarian principles, as his church had been in the poſſeſſion of the Arians forty years.

Theodoſius, however, hoping to gain the Macedonians, as they did not differ much from the catholics, permitted their biſhops to attend. Accordingly, there were aſſembled about one hundred and fifty Conſubſtantialiſts, and twenty ſix of the Macedonians, the latter chiefly from the cities in the neighbourhood of the Helleſpont, and at the head of them were Eleuſius of Cyzicum, and Marcianus of Lampſacum.

Lampſacum. Among the Conſubſtantialiſts, Timothy biſhop of Alexandria preſided.

When they were aſſembled, the emperor, and the biſhops of his own perſuaſion, did every thing in their power to prevail upon the Macedonians to concur with them in ſubſcribing the Homoouſian doctrine, reminding them of their having voluntarily done ſo, when, in the former reign, they had applied to Liberius, and after that time had made no difficulty of continuing in communion with them. But they could not be prevailed upon; and leaving Conſtantinople, they wrote to their friends, exhorting them to adhere to their principles, and never to conſent to the doctrine of the Nicene creed. From this it is evident, that they had ſufficiently repented of their former compliance, and even that the perſecution which they muſt have expected from Theodoſius would not induce them to act the part that they had done in the time of Valens.

The biſhops of the Homoouſian party being now alone, choſe Nectarius a layman, and a perſon of ſenatorial rank, for biſhop of Conſtantinople. At the time of his election he was not even baptized, though pretty far advanced in years. But, like Ambroſe, who in circumſtances very ſimilar to his had been

made biſhop of Milan, not being able to decline the honour that was offered him, he firſt went through all the forms of baptiſm, wearing a dreſs proper for the purpoſe, according to the cuſtom of that age, and after other neceſſary ſteps was regularly ordained biſhop. Gregory, whoſe ordination had been much objected to by Timothy of Alexandria, and by the oriental biſhops in general, made no objection to their proceedings, and peaceably departed for Nazianzum *.

Nectarius, being now biſhop of Conſtantinople, joined his brethren, who remained after the Arian biſhops had left the place, as a member of this celebrated council, the ſecond in rank after that of Nice; having, like it, obtained the title of *æcumenical*, or *univerſal*, though it conſiſted of no more than one hundred and fifty biſhops.

* It might be in part from reſentment of his treatment in this council, that this Gregory, being afterwards invited to attend one, ſaid that he avoided all aſſemblies of biſhops, that he had never known any of them to terminate well, and that ſo far had they been from removing any evils, they had increaſed them; that their contention and love of power were not to be deſcribed. Epiſt. xlii. Opera, p. 814. The obſervation however is very true, and will apply to all the councils, of which we have a ſufficiently diſtinct account. But the ſame is the caſe with the aſſemblies of other men, whoſe views and intereſts interfere.

The

The firſt thing of any importance that was done in this council was to confirm the doctrine of the Nicene creed, adding, as if it had been a neceſſary conſequence of it, that the three perſons in the trinity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, were *equal in power and glory*. This they called confirming the doctrine of Nice. But it is a remarkable inſtance of perſons impoſing upon themſelves with reſpect to the antiquity of their opinions. For it was going much farther than the Nicene Fathers had any idea of, and what they would have unanimouſly diſclaimed.

They believed the Son to be *of the ſame ſubſtance* with the Father, but they had by no means any ſuch idea with reſpect to the Holy Spirit, and ſtill leſs would they have thought of making either the Son, or the Holy Spirit, *equal* to the Father. Now, however, this doctrine, which has been the ſtandard of orthodoxy ever ſince, was firſt confirmed by the authority of a general council, after having been advanced, and contended for, in the writings of the more zealous divines. It was alſo determined, that no churches ſhould remain in the poſſeſſion of any biſhops who did not hold this new doctrine *.

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. vii. Cap. 7, 8. p. 285. Socratis Hiſt. Lib. v. Cap. 7, 8. p. 267.

It likewiſe appears from the ſynodical letter of this council, which is preſerved in Theodoret, that the doctrine of Apollinaris, viz. of Chriſt having taken only *fleſh* of the Virgin, and not having a proper human ſoul, was condemned in it. Damaſus biſhop of Rome, and a ſynod of biſhops aſſembled there, joined this council at Conſtantinople in the condemnation of this doctrine, and in the excommunication of Apollinaris himſelf and Timothius his diſciple. They alſo anathematized thoſe who ſay that the Holy Spirit was made by the Son, or that he is not of the ſame power and ſubſtance with the Father and the Son; and in a ſeparate condemnation of all hereſies, they inſert the opinion aſcribed to Apollinaris, of the divine nature of the Son ſuffering, and not his body and ſoul only. This writing contains the higheſt orthodoxy of the age, expreſſed in the moſt definite and unequivocal language, very ſimilar to that of the Athanaſian creed (as it is now called) as it particularly condemns thoſe who ſay that, in conſequence of acknowledging the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, ſeparately conſidered, to be each of them properly *God*, there will then be *three Gods*, and not *one God*, only*

* Theod. H. Lib. v. Cap. 10. p. 209.

In

In this council a new diſtribution was made of the dioceſes, becauſe in the late perſecution much confuſion had been introduced with reſpect to the former regulations. To the biſhop of Conſtantinople was aſſigned the city, and the province of Thrace, to the biſhop of Cæſarea in Cappadocia, was given Pontus, &c. It is to be obſerved that theſe *dioceſes*, as they were called, were not under the juriſdiction of *biſhops* as ſuch, but of metropolitan biſhops, being the biſhops of the chief towns and provinces. In that age a biſhop is never ſaid to have had the government of more than one *church*, or *pariſh*, though it ſometimes conſiſted of ſeveral congregations. But the biſhops of theſe metropolitan ſees preſided over whole provinces, in which were many biſhops *.

No perſon can give any attention to this council, and imagine that there was any thing like freedom of diſcuſſion in it. The emperor aſſembled only thoſe biſhops who he thought would concur with him in fixing ſuch a creed as he approved, and in doing every thing elſe that he wiſhed them to do; and they were not half the number that Conſtantine, in a much earlier period of the chriſ-

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. vii. Cap. 9. p. 288. Socratis Hiſt. Lib. v. Cap. 8. p. 268.

tian

tian hiſtory had aſſembled at Nice. Theodoſius would not have invited the Macedonians to attend this council, but with the hope of perſuading them to join the other biſhops; and as ſoon as this appeared to be impracticable, they were diſmiſſed. This being ſo ſoon after the time of Valens, who had aſſembled ſeveral councils of Arian biſhops, and much more numerous than this, there can be no doubt but that, if Theodoſius had been ſo diſpoſed, he might very eaſily have brought together more biſhops than he did upon this occaſion, to fix almoſt any other creed that he ſhould have thought proper.

That the biſhops aſſembled in council had any ſupernatural direction in forming their decrees, does not ſeem to have been imagined in this age. All that they pretended to was to declare what, in their opinion, had been the faith of their anceſtors; and in aſcertaining this, they did not proceed in any regular method of inquiry into the ſtate of opinions in former times, but decided according to their *own* opinions, which were formed under the influences that have been deſcribed.

SECT.

SECTION III.

Other Endeavours of Theodoſius to ſupport the Catholic Faith.

THIS zealous and well diſpoſed emperor, unwilling to give up his favourite project of uniting all chriſtians in one common faith, had recourſe to another method of gaining his end. He ſummoned the heads of all the different ſects, thinking that, by conferring amicably together, they might come to ſome agreement. But Nectarius, the newly choſen biſhop of Conſtantinople, and Agelius the biſhop of the Novatians in that city, who were both Conſubſtantialiſts, after diſcourſing together on the ſubject, adviſed the emperor not to permit the different ſectaries to diſpute together; ſince no differences had ever been compoſed by that means, but had always been the more inflamed. They therefore wiſhed that he would propoſe to them whether they would abide by the opinions of thoſe chriſtians who wrote before the origin of the late differences, thinking that, if

if they agreed to put the matter upon this iſſue, they might eaſily be confuted, and if they refuſed, they would be excommunicated by their own churches.

Accordingly, this propoſal was made to them by the emperor, and a proper time was allowed them to give their anſwers. But upon this they were divided, ſome thinking the propoſal a reaſonable one, and others the contrary, eſpecially as they entertained different opinions concerning the ancient writers; and upon this occaſion not only did the heads of the ſeveral ſects differ from each other, but even thoſe who were of the ſame ſect. Thus the ſcheme of theſe two biſhops proved to be no better than that of the emperor. He therefore tried another of his own.

Finding that the heads of the different ſects could not come to any agreement with reſpect to their anſwer to his queſtion, he, in the next place, deſired them to bring their ſeveral creeds in writing. Accordingly, one was preſented by Demophilus, on the part of the Arians; another by Eunomius himſelf, on the part of his ſect; and another by Eleuſius of Cyzicum, on the part of the Macedonians. For the Arians, it ſeems, were now divided into three parties, though it is not

not ſaid in what reſpects thoſe who are here called *Arians*, and *Macedonians*, differed from each other; but the latter were properly Conſubſtantialiſts with reſpect to the Son, though not ſo with reſpect to the Holy Spirit. Whether any more creeds were produced is not ſaid. Theſe, however, the emperor took with him into his cloſet; and having prayed fervently that God would enable him to diſcern the truth, he read them carefully over, and then, as the hiſtorians ſay, condemning all that made a diviſion in the trinity, he adopted the Conſubſtantial faith only; and as the Novatians held this faith, he allowed their congregations the ſame privileges as thoſe of the catholic churches.

As it is not ſaid that the emperor received any anſwer to his prayer (which could only be aſcertained by ſome miracle) it is evident that this deciſion, however carefully and piouſly formed, was only his own private opinion, and therefore certainly of no more authority than that of any other perſon. It is evident, however, that the emperor had not perfect confidence in the deciſion of his council. For if he had, this kind of appeal to heaven would have been ſuperfluous. As to the leaders of thoſe ſects whoſe creeds the

emperor had rejected, the hiſtorians ſay that they went home much chagrined, but comforted their adherents on the occaſion, and on the defection of their friends, by ſaying that *many were called, but few choſen;* a doctrine which they had not preached when they were the majority.

The emperor, thinking that he had now done all that was in his power to promote uniformity of opinion by *peaceable methods*, had recourſe to *force*. For by a law he enacted on this occaſion, he forbade all who had been declared *heretics*, to hold any aſſemblies for public worſhip, to teach their opinions, or to ordain biſhops. Some he baniſhed from the cities, and others from the empire itſelf; and ſome he branded with infamy, excluding them from all the rights of citizens. But the hiſtorian ſays that, though he annexed heavy puniſhments to the breach of theſe laws, he was not rigorous in exacting them, hoping to bring the ſectaries into the pale of his church by terror, as well as by rewards; for he greatly favoured thoſe who came over of their own accord *.

This hiſtory is a very inſtructive one, ſhewing how ineffectual are all ſchemes to

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. v. Cap. 10. p. 272. Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. vii. Cap. 12. p. 292.

produce

produce uniformity of opinion in a ſhort time. But we may be confident that, without the interference of any authority, this will be the natural conſequence of free diſcuſſion, with reſpect to every queſtion of importance, in a due courſe of time. It is in vain for men to attempt to accelerate the courſe of nature. Truth is ſure to prevail, and every thing that reaſonable men deſire will be gained; but ſufficient *time* muſt be allowed for the purpoſe.

During theſe proceedings at Conſtantinople Maximus declared himſelf emperor in Britain; and in oppoſing him Gratian loſt his life, after a reign of fifteen years; but from the death of his father not quite eight years *. But Theodoſius marching againſt him, his own ſoldiers delivered him up, and he was put to death.

* Gratian had been educated with the greateſt care by his father Valentinian, and was in all reſpects an accompliſhed prince. He was deſerted by his troops who thought he gave too much preference to ſtrangers. He concurred with Theodoſius in all meaſures to ſuppreſs what they deemed to be hereſy. On the death of Gratian, Valentinian II. remained ſole emperor of the Weſt. Both of them were governed by Ambroſe, the orthodox biſhop of Milan, in all matters relating to religion. Gratian was the firſt of the chriſtian emperors who refuſed the title of *Pontifex Maximus*.

Whil:

While this war was carrying on, two attempts were made in favour of Arianiſm, one in the Eaſt, and the other in the Weſt. In the abſence of Theodoſius, and upon a rumour of his ill ſucceſs, the Arians in Conſtantinople made an inſurrection, in which the houſe of Nectarius was burned down.

In the Weſt, Juſtina, the wife of Valentinian, who was an Arian, but who had no power while her huſband was living, endeavoured, by influencing her ſon, to expel Ambroſe from the ſee of Milan; but the people took the part of the biſhop, and prevented it. Notwithſtanding this, it is ſaid, ſhe made a law, by which all who did not ſubſcribe the creed of Ariminum ſhould be expelled from their churches, and be puniſhed with death. News however arriving of the death of Gratian, a ſtop was put to her proceedings. As Socrates ſays nothing of this law to enforce the creed of Ariminum, and only mentions the attempts of Juſtina to baniſh Ambroſe, it is probable that this was all that ſhe aimed at. Indeed the other project would have been abſurd in the extreme *.

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. vii. Cap. 13. p. 293. Socratis Hiſt. Lib. v. Cap. 11. 13. p. 276. 279. Theod. Hiſt. Lib. v. Cap. 13. p. 212.

SEC-

SECTION IV.

Transactions of a mixed Nature, civil and religious, with an Account of Theodosius's Death and Character.

WHILE Theodosius was employed in the East, Valentinian the younger was as unfortunate in the West as Gratian had been. For Eugenius and Arbogastes, conspiring against him, put him to death. Upon this Theodosius marched into the West, leaving both his sons in Constantinople, and defeated Eugenius near Aquileia; and when this usurper threw himself at the feet of Theodosius, his guards, who were apprehensive that their master would spare his life, without waiting for his orders, dispatched him. Arbogastes killed himself.

While Theodosius was preparing for this war, it was found necessary to lay heavier taxes on the people than usual; and this was the occasion of a very alarming insurrection at Antioch, where the populace threw down the statues of the emperor and empress, and

dragged them about the ſtreets. The emperor hearing of this, and being naturally haſty, gave orders for the ſlaughter of many of the inhabitants, which, when they were recovered from their fury, threw them into the greateſt conſternation. Flavianus their biſhop interceded for them in vain; but ſome doleful ſupplicating ſongs having been compoſed on the occaſion, ſome young men (who were uſed to entertain the emperor by ſinging while he was at meals) were gained to ſing ſome of them; and Theodoſius was ſo affected by them, that he burſt into tears, and pardoned the people. But according to Theodoret (who places this ſtory after the ſubſequent one concerning Theſſalonica) the emperor was pacified by the remonſtrances of Macedonius a monk, who repreſented to him, that, if he was ſo much offended at the indignity offered to his lifeleſs ſtatues, much more would God be offended at the violence which he was about to commit on his living images. Brazen ſtatues, he ſaid, might be replaced, but he could not reproduce a ſingle hair of any man whom he ſhould put to death*.

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. vii. Cap. 23. p. 313. Theod. Hiſt. Lib. v. Cap. 20. p. 220.

Unfortunately,

Unfortunately, another caſe of provocation occurred, in which Theodoſius did not check his reſentment in time, and the effects were indeed dreadful. Butherius the governor of Theſſalonica had apprehended a celebrated charioteer for attempting an unnatural crime; but as he was much wanted for the chariot races, which were at hand, the populace were very clamorous for his releaſe, and the officer not thinking proper to yield to their intreaties, they grew tumultuous, and at length killed him. The emperor hearing of this was in a great rage, and ordered a party of ſoldiers to put to death a certain number of the people whom they ſhould firſt meet with, without making any diſtinction; and in conſequence of this raſh order, a great ſlaughter was made in the city; and many of the ſufferers being innocent perſons, their caſes excited particular compaſſion.

Ambroſe biſhop of Milan being informed of this, when the emperor, after his victory over Eugenius, was about to go into the church in that city, he reſolutely forbade him, as having his hands pollutted with innocent blood; and the emperor, having probably repented of his raſhneſs before, was not offended with his freedom, but withdrew, full of ſhame and

repentance. He afterwards made a public confeſſion of his ſin, as other penitents did, and was not admitted to communion till after the uſual term of penance, and in all that time he refrained from wearing the purple robe. As a part of his penance enjoined by the biſhop, he made a law that all capital puniſhments ſhould be deferred till thirty days after the orders given for them. This ſtory does great honour both to the biſhop and the emperor. He could not be a bad man who, though he committed ſo great a fault, was capable of acknowleding it in this manner. Ambroſe alſo diſtinguiſhed himſelf by his ordering that the emperors, when they were at church, ſhould not ſit, as they had been uſed to do, in order to be the more conſpicuous, within the rails of the chancel, but before them, among the people; a cuſtom which Sozomen ſays was obſerved ever after*.

Theodoſius made ſeveral regulations in favour of public virtue. At Conſtantinople there had been perſons who made a trade of ſelling proſtitutes, and the practice had been tolerated on account of the advantage which the revenue had derived from it. This, however, the emperor put a ſtop to as ſoon as he

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. vii. Cap. 25. p. 315. Theod. Hiſt. Lib. v. Cap. 17, 18. p. 215.

was

was acquainted with it; and Florentius the præfect of the prætorian guards, ſeeing the loſs which would thence accrue to the treaſury, ſold an eſtate of his own to make it good*.

During the ſhort time that Theodoſius was in Italy, he greatly benefited the city of Rome, in part by his liberalities, but chiefly by removing two great nuiſances, the diſcovery of one of which was accidental, but very fortunate. There was in the city a large building where bread was made to be diſtributed to the citizens, and being near ſome public ſtews, ſtrangers were by this means often decoyed into it, and being ſeized upon, were compelled to work all their lives under ground. One of Theodoſius's ſoldiers fell into this ſnare; but drawing his ſword, and killing thoſe who would have detained him, he made his eſcape; and the emperor being informed of it ordered all the perſons who had been concerned in this horrid buſineſs to be puniſhed as they deſerved, and the place to be demoliſhed.

It had been a cuſtom in one part of Rome that women convicted of adultery, ſhould be

* Sueur, A. D. 439.

expoſed to proſtitution with any perſons who choſe to have commerce with them. This indecency was alſo forbidden by Theodoſius, and other more proper puniſhments provided for the caſe*

Theodoſius continued ſome time at Milan after the reduction of Eugenius, and finding himſelf indiſpoſed (Philoſtorgius ſays his diſeaſe was a dropſy†) ſent for his ſon Honorius from Conſtantinople. On his arrival he found himſelf better, and intended to have preſided at the Circenſian games, which were to be exhibited on the occaſion of his victory; but being worſe after dinner, he deſired his ſon to preſide, and in the night following he died, A. D. 395, in the ſixtieth year of his age, and the ſeventeenth of his reign, leaving two ſons of the ſame religious perſuaſion with himſelf, of whom Arcadius, the elder, reigned in the Eaſt, and Honorius, the younger, in the Weſt. Addreſſing himſelf to his ſons juſt before his death, he exhorted them not only as individuals, but as emperors, to cultivate ſincere piety. "By this," ſaid he "peace is maintained, and war extinguiſhed,

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. v. Cap. 18. p. 284.
† Hiſt. Lib. ii. Cap. 2. p. 538.

By

"By this enemies are diſperſed, and victories "acquired*."

Several circumſtances in the hiſtory of Theodoſius diſcover much true greatneſs of mind. He was raiſed to the empire without any intrigue or endeavours of his own, by the mere opinion of his merit and ability; an opinion which was abundantly juſtified by his ſubſequent conduct. By his ability as a warrior he ſaved the ſtate, and he was the ſteady friend of Gratian, who called him to partake of the empire, and to his family after him, without ever ſeeming to wiſh for more power than was allotted him. He very properly revenged the death of his benefactors; but if Maximus would have been content with his ſucceſs againſt Gratian, he would have divided the empire with him rather than riſque the injuring of it by a civil war.

If Theodoſius had the virtues, he had alſo the faults of Conſtantine; or rather he fell into the ſame *miſtake*, in thinking it his duty to ſupport the right faith by civil power. But this had been done without any cenſure by all

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. v. Cap. 26. p. 304. Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. vii. Cap. 29. p. 322. Theod. Hiſt. Lib. v. Cap. 25. p. 228.

the chriſtian emperors before him, except Jovian, who did not live long enough fully to declare himſelf; and all who followed him trod in the ſame ſteps. Indeed, the late reformers from popery did not think it right to leave truth unſupported by civil power. It is much to be lamented that this idea, which has been productive of ſo much evil, ſhould ever have been taken up, and ſhould have been acted upon ſo long. But the moſt enlightened of the preſent age cannot ſuppoſe that even themſelves would have judged, or acted, otherwiſe than great and wiſe men did in this early period.

Theodoſius was in ſome reſpects more tolerant than ſome of the biſhops of his age. For when the monks of Callinica in the Eaſt, who had been diſturbed in their devotions by ſome Jews, had, in revenge, burned their ſynagogue, he ordered the Count of the Eaſt to rebuild it at his own expence; though by a letter, and the perſonal application of Ambroſe, he was induced to revoke the order*.

As far as appears, Theodoſius, to all the ability of a great general, added a conſtant deſire to adminiſter the affairs of the empire

* Vita Ambroſii, Opera Vol. i. p. 54.

in

in the beſt manner, without being drawn aſide by private gratification, or perſonal reſentment. That he had ſtrong paſſions, from which perhaps no truly *great man* (by which I here mean a man of great energy of mind, and a capacity for public buſineſs) was ever wholly exempt, is evident from the hiſtory of what paſſed with reſpect to Antioch and Theſſalonica. But in both caſes he had great provocation, and his offence was followed by ſincere repentance. From the idea that I have of the character of Julian, if he had reigned half ſo long as Theodoſius did, he would have been capable of much greater cruelties, and without repenting of them.

Philoſtorgius ſays that Theodoſius was addicted to intemperance, and that the diſorder of which he died was brought on by it *. But the orthodox hiſtorians praiſe him for his ſobriety and moderation; ſaying that in theſe reſpects he was the reverſe of Trajan, whom he greatly reſembled in moſt other particulars, and even in his perſon.

* Hiſt. Lib. xi. Cap. 2. p. 539.

SEC-

SECTION V.

Of Heatheniſm in this Period.

TILL this reign it is remarkable that the heathens had made no attempts to reſtore their worſhip, but had ſeen the deſtruction of many of their temples, and the prohibition of their ſacrifices and feſtivals, with ſilent indignation. But the zeal of Theophilus biſhop of Alexandria in executing the orders of Theodoſius, to deſtroy the temples in that city, provoked them beyond their uſual forbearance, or any prudent regard to conſequences.

On the requeſt of the biſhop, a temple of Bacchus had been converted into a chriſtian church; and when the ſecret places of this temple were laid open, the biſhop made a public ſpectacle of whatever was found in them, and eſpecially of ſome *Phalli*. This ridiculous exhibition of the ſymbols of their worſhip the heathen inhabitants could not bear; but ſuddenly ruſhing upon the chriſtians,

tians, they killed and wounded many, and then took poſſeſſion of the temple of Serapis, ſituated on an eminence; and ſallying from that place, as from a fortreſs, they ſeized many chriſtians, and when they refuſed to ſacrifice, cruelly tortured them. They even crucificed ſome, and put others to different kinds of death.

The magiſtrates then interpoſed, and would have perſuaded the people to leave the temple, and ceaſe from hoſtilities. But this made them the more inſolent; and Olympious, a philoſopher, encouraged them to perſiſt, and die fighting for their religion. And when they were diſcouraged at the havoc that was made of their images, he told them that the images were periſhable things, but that the divinity which reſided in them went up to heaven, and could not be hurt. They therefore remained in the temple, and nothing was done to moleſt them till the emperor's orders were received. In the mean time, great numbers of the heathens, alarmed at what they had done, fled to different places, Olympius to Italy, and two grammarians, Helladius and Ammonius, to Conſtantinople, where Socrates the hiſtorian ſays that he attended their lectures when he was a young man.

At

At length the orders of Theodoſius arrived, and they were thoſe of a truly chriſtian emperor. He freely pardoned all who had been concerned in the diſturbance, hoping that by this generoſity he might gain them over to the chriſtian religion; but he ordered all the heathen temples, without diſtinction, to be totally demoliſhed. In doing this the ſtatues were converted into veſſels for the uſe of the church of Alexandria. But Theophilus preſerved one of them, that it might be occaſionally expoſed in public, leſt the heathens ſhould deny that they ever had had ſuch objects of worſhip. This Ammonius took very ill, as it was preſerved, he ſaid, for no other purpoſe than to turn his religion into ridicule *.

In ſome other places alſo beſides Alexandria the heathens at this time fought for their religion, as the people of Petra and Acropolis in Arabia, thoſe of Raphia and Gaza in Paleſtine, and thoſe of Heliopolis in Phenice. In Syria the people of Apamea, on the river Axius, commonly made uſe of a garriſon of the people of Galilee, and other country people from the villages about mount Liba-

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. v. Cap. 16. p. 281. Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. vii. Cap. 15. p. 296. Theod. Hiſt. Lib. v. Cap. 23. p. 223.

nus

nus for the defence of their temples; and Marcellus the biſhop of the place loſt his life in conſequence of an over zealous and imprudent attempt to put an end to their worſhip.

Hearing that the moſt conſiderable of their temples was in Aulon, a diſtrict of Apamea, he took a company of ſoldiers and gladiators, in order to demoliſh it; but being himſelf lame, he remained at ſome diſtance till the buſineſs ſhould be done. But while his people were buſy in demoliſhing the temple, the heathens, ſeeing him alone, ruſhed upon him, and burned him alive. For ſome time the perpetrators of this murder were unknown, but afterwards they were diſcovered, and the ſons of Marcellus were deſirous of revenging their father's death. But a ſynod of the province forbade it, alleging that it was not reaſonable to require any ſatisfaction for this death, when both the deceaſed himſelf, and his children and friends had cauſe to give thanks for it, ſince he had the honour of dying in the cauſe of God *.

It is evident from the fact of theſe temples and images having been ſuffered to remain ſo long undiſturbed, that the orders of the pre-

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. vii. Cap. 15. p. 298. Theod. Hiſt. Lib. v. Cap. 21. p. 221.

ceding

At length the orders of Theodoſius arrived, and they were thoſe of a truly chriſtian emperor. He freely pardoned all who had been concerned in the diſturbance, hoping that by this generoſity he might gain them over to the chriſtian religion; but he ordered all the heathen temples, without diſtinction, to be totally demoliſhed. In doing this the ſtatues were converted into veſſels for the uſe of the church of Alexandria. But Theophilus preſerved one of them, that it might be occaſionally expoſed in public, leſt the heathens ſhould deny that they ever had had ſuch objects of worſhip. This Ammonius took very ill, as it was preſerved, he ſaid, for no other purpoſe than to turn his religion into ridicule *.

In ſome other places alſo beſides Alexandria the heathens at this time fought for their religion, as the people of Petra and Acropolis in Arabia, thoſe of Raphia and Gaza in Paleſtine, and thoſe of Heliopolis in Phenice. In Syria the people of Apamea, on the river Axius, commonly made uſe of a garriſon of the people of Galilee, and other country people from the villages about mount Liba-

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. v. Cap. 16. p. 281. Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. vii. Cap. 15. p. 296. Theod. Hiſt. Lib. v. Cap. 23. p. 223.

nus

nus for the defence of their temples; and Marcellus the biſhop of the place loſt his life in conſequence of an over zealous and imprudent attempt to put an end to their worſhip.

Hearing that the moſt conſiderable of their temples was in Aulon, a diſtrict of Apamea, he took a company of ſoldiers and gladiators, in order to demoliſh it; but being himſelf lame, he remained at ſome diſtance till the buſineſs ſhould be done. But while his people were buſy in demoliſhing the temple, the heathens, ſeeing him alone, ruſhed upon him, and burned him alive. For ſome time the perpetrators of this murder were unknown, but afterwards they were diſcovered, and the ſons of Marcellus were deſirous of revenging their father's death. But a ſynod of the province forbade it, alleging that it was not reaſonable to require any ſatisfaction for this death, when both the deceaſed himſelf, and his children and friends had cauſe to give thanks for it, ſince he had the honour of dying in the cauſe of God*.

It is evident from the fact of theſe temples and images having been ſuffered to remain ſo long undiſturbed, that the orders of the pre-

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. vii. Cap. 15. p. 298. Theod. Hiſt. Lib. v. Cap. 21. p. 221.

ceding

ceding emperors for the demolition of ſuch things had not been executed with rigour. The heathen worſhip was kept up in ſo many places, that if there had been any thing faſcinating in it, it might have had its full effect. But every exhibition of the heathen worſhip after the promulgation of chriſtianity only tended to expoſe it to ridicule. The ſame advantage, we need not doubt, all truth, and good ſenſe, will have in time over error and abſurdity; and the corruptions of chriſtianity, when they are fairly exhibited, will fall before the pure and genuine doctrines of it, as heatheniſm did before chriſtianity itſelf.

A more peaceable attempt was in this period made at Rome, countenanced by a perſon of the higheſt reputation, though a heathen, to reſtore ſome of the ceremonies of heatheniſm in that city. I mean the requeſt that was made by the ſenate, and preſented by Symmachus, to Valentinian the younger, during the uſurpation of Eugenius, to replace the image and altar of victory, which had been fixed before the ſenate houſe, and at which the ſenators had been accuſtomed to ſwear allegiance to the emperor when they entered upon their office. Conſtantius, when he was at Rome A. D. 356, or 357, had ordered

dered this altar to be removed; but, having been reſtored by Julian, it had continued till it was again removed by Gratian A.D. 382; when he likewiſe ſeized the lands which had been allotted for the maintenance of the prieſts and the ſacrifices, and abrogated the privileges of the veſtal virgins.

Complaints were made on the ſubject; but Gratian paid no regard to them. But not long after his death the ſenate ſent this deputation to Valentinian the younger; and it may not be amiſs to conſider what was alleged by ſo able a man as Symmachus in favour of heatheniſm, in ſo late a period. And very happily we have this petition intire, ſo that we can ſatisfy ourſelves that it contains nothing that any reaſonable man can now think deſerving of attention. The amount of the whole is, that heatheniſm was the religion of their anceſtors, and that the empire flouriſhed by its means. Speaking in the perſon of Rome, he ſays, "Let me "live in my own way. I am free, and have "a right to be ſo. This way of worſhip "has brought all the world into obedience to "my laws. Theſe rites drove Hannibal from "my walls, and the Gauls from the capitol. "And have I lived ſo long to be corrected in

"my

"my old age? Let me know what this new "institution is? Sure I am that to reclaim "old age is an unreasonable, and dishonour-"able undertaking."

This petition likewise mentions a general famine, as having followed the confiscation of the revenues which had been appropriated to the maintenance of those ceremonies. But to this it was justly replied by Ambrose, and others, who opposed the petition, that the religion of Rome had been greatly changed since the time of Romulus, and that it was highly reasonable that the world should be allowed to grow wiser. As to the famine, it was only local, and did not afflict the whole empire; and such calamities had been frequent in all times. Accordingly no regard was paid to this petition.

In A. D. 388 it is supposed another petition was made to Theodosius, to procure the restoration of this altar of Victory, and that this request also was supported by Symmachus. But it had no more effect than the former. However, in A. D. 392, which was after the death of Valentinian, Eugenius restored this altar; and at this time, as this usurper was disposed to favour the heathens, their expectations were greatly raised; vic-

tims were multiplied in Rome, all kinds of divination were practiced, and Flavianus the præfect of the city, who was thought to be very ſkilful in thoſe rites, encouraged Eugenius with ſtrong aſſurances of ſucceſs and victory. Notwithſtanding this, he was ſoon defeated; and after his death it cannot be doubted that Theodoſius ordered all that had been done with reſpect to the altar of victory to be undone, though no particular mention is made of it by hiſtorians. It was thought extraordinary that Eugenius, who was a chriſtian himſelf, ſhould oblige the heathens ſo much as he did in this reſpect, and Ambroſe remonſtrated againſt it. The whole of this account is extracted from Lardner, to whoſe authorities I refer my reader*.

We may now expreſs our ſurpriſe, that a man of virtue and ability, as Symmachus was, ſhould adhere to a religion in favour of which he had ſo little to allege. But at this time heathens of his character were very few, and they were infinitely out-numbered by men of ſuperior virtue and ability who continually became chriſtians. It is very poſſible that Symmachus, like Pliny the younger,

* Teſtimonies Vol. iv. p. 372, &c.

Marcus Antoninus, and many other heathens, who were both men of letters, and men of buſineſs, might have given very little attention to the ſubject of chriſtianity; and in this caſe their opinion ought not to have any weight at all. At this day we ſee men of the beſt underſtandings, either through inattention, or prejudice, maintain opinions which thoſe who give more attention to the ſubject, and are leſs prejudiced, are well ſatisfied have no reaſonable foundation.

The minds of men are ſubject to a great variety of influences, which, independently of any thing that can be called *evidence*, miſlead them in judging concerning truth; and nothing more ſtrongly biaſſes moſt men, and eſpecially the virtuous and well-diſpoſed, than reſpect for the opinions and practices of their parents and remote anceſtors.

Conſidering the progreſs that chriſtianity had made by its own evidence before the time of Conſtantine, it can be no wonder that, when it had the additional aid of civil power, it ſhould ſo ſoon complete its triumph over heatheniſm. It is to be regretted, however, that it ſhould not have been ſuffered to complete this triumph, as no doubt it would have done by the ſame means by which it firſt made

made its way in the world. But Theodoſius, in whoſe time the remains of the ancient religion muſt have been inconſiderable, and not at all formidable, was too impatient to clear his dominions of it.

It having been obſerved that the heathens, from ancient cuſtom, went to particular places for the obſervance of certain rites, Theodoſius from the beginning of his reign forbade all acceſs to ſuch places, and many of the temples he entirely deſtroyed; ſo that the heathens, having no places of worſhip to go to, by degrees frequented thoſe of the chriſtians, eſpecially when they found ſome amuſement in their feſtivals.

It being obſerved, however, that many of the heathens, when they were deprived of their temples, ſacrificed and performed their other rites within their own premiſes, Theodoſius made a new law, by which this private exerciſe of the heathen religion was puniſhed with confiſcation of goods, and even with death.

When this law was carried into execution in Egypt, the people were exceedingly offended that they were not permitted to ſacrifice to the river, as their anceſtors had been

uſed to do, and were apprehenſive that it would not riſe as uſual in conſequence of it. It was even feared that there would be an inſurrection on this account. But the emperor being informed of it, replied, that the flowing of the Nile, and the plenty depending upon it, were not to be preferred to our duty to God. "May the river," ſaid he, "never "flow again, if it cannot be procured with-"out charms, ſacrifices, and blood." However, the emperor perſevered in his meaſures, and it was obſerved that the Nile was ſo far from not riſing, that it roſe ſo high that the people were afraid of an inundation; and this was a means of bringing over many of the heathen Egyptians to chriſtianity *.

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. vii. Cap. 20. p. 309.

SECT.

SECTION VI.

Of the Priſcillianiſts, and Unitarians in this Period.

IN this reign there aroſe a new ſect in the Weſt, which is not ſo much as noticed by any of the Greek writers, I mean the *Priſcillianiſts*, who held a mixture of Gnoſtic and Unitarian opinions. The origin of this ſect, ſays Sulpitius Severus *, is from Egypt, from which country one Marcus, a native of Memphis, brought it into Spain. His firſt converts were Agape, a woman of rank, and Helpidius a rhetorician; but the name was derived from their diſciple *Priſcillian*, a man of a noble family, very wealthy, learned, and eloquent. In other reſpects alſo this writer gives him a very high character, ſaying that he equally excelled in the qualifications of body and mind, that he was capable of bearing watching, hunger, and thirſt, that he was

* Lib. ii. Cap. 46. p. 280.

not desirous of acquiring any thing, and very moderate in the use of what he did possess.

As soon as Priscillian began to teach he made many converts, both among persons of rank, and those of the lower classes; and the women flocked to him in crouds, his modest appearance inspiring all persons with reverence. By this means his doctrine soon spread through all Spain, and was received by some bishops, among whom were Instantius and Salvianus. Adyginus the bishop of Corduba, in whose neighbourhood the new sect spread the most, engaged Idatius an old bishop to oppose them. But he being much too violent, the Priscillianists were increased, rather than diminished, in consequence of his interference.

After much controversy, a synod was held on the subject at Saragossa, at which the bishops from Aquitania in Gaul were present; and the Priscillianists not chusing to attend, they were condemned in their absence, and in this sentence were particularly involved Instantius and Salvianus, who were bishops, and Priscillian and Helpidius who were laymen; and those who should receive them into communion were ordered to be excommunicated. In the mean time Instantius and Salvianus ordained

ordained Priſcillian a biſhop; but Idatius, and Ithacius, who had been appointed to acquaint other biſhops with the decrees of the ſynod, being more urgent than ever to ſuppreſs this riſing ſect, before it ſhould have acquired more ſtrength, very imprudently, ſays our author, applied to the ſecular judges to baniſh the heretics from their cities. In conſequence of this a reſcript was procured from the emperor Gratian, by which they were baniſhed not only from the cities, but from the empire, ſo that for ſome time they were totally diſperſed.

But Inſtantius, Salvianus, and Priſcillian went to Rome, to clear themſelves of what was laid to their charge before Damaſus the biſhop of that city, and in their way they made many converts, eſpecially among the more ſerious kind of the lower people. Damaſus refuſing to ſee them, and Ambroſe of Milan being equally hoſtile to them, they applied to Macedonius, an officer near the emperor's perſon; and by his means procured an order to reſtore them to their churches; and on this Inſtantius and Priſcillian returned to Spain. For Salvianus had died at Rome.

The enemies of Priſcillian being diſappointed in their farther applications to Gra-

tian, turned their eyes towards Maximus, who had aſſumed the empire in Britain; and on his arrival at Triers, and hearing what was ſuggeſted againſt Priſcillian and his friends, he appointed a ſynod to meet at Burdeaux. There Inſtantius was depoſed, but Priſcillian appealed to the emperor. When the cauſe came to be heard, Ithacius, who undertook the accuſation of Priſcillian, was ſo violent, that he accuſed almoſt all perſons of a ſtudious turn of being favourers of Priſcillian, without excepting even Martin the biſhop of Triers, who had ſtrongly objected to bringing this caſe before a civil tribunal, and at whoſe interceſſion Maximus had promiſed that no capital puniſhment ſhould be inflicted in the caſe. But on the application of other biſhops, he referred the cauſe to Evodius the præfect, a violent man, who ſentenced Priſcillian to be put to death; and accordingly he was executed, together with ſeveral of his diſciples, of whom alſo ſome were baniſhed, and others had their goods confiſcated.

Theſe proceedings, however, were ſo far from putting a ſtop to the doctrine of Priſcillian, that it was propagated farther than ever in conſequence of them. For his followers, who had before reſpected him as a

ſaint,

ſaint now honoured him as a martyr, and the bodies of thoſe who had been put to death on this occaſion were carried to Spain, and buried with the greateſt ſolemnity. The followers of Priſcillian, our author ſays, even ſwore by his name; and the diſturbance which aroſe from this buſineſs was not at all allayed fifteen years afterwards, which was the time of his writing; but he aſcribes much of the confuſion which then prevailed in the country to the ambition, and other vices, of the clergy.

That the Priſcillianiſts held ſome Gnoſtic opinions cannot be doubted, becauſe they are univerſally aſcribed to them. They conſidered matter as the cauſe of all evil, they condemned marriage, and ſaid that the ſouls of of men were of a divine ſubſtance; and having offended in heaven, were ſent into bodies as a puniſhment of their ſins. Like many of the early Gnoſtics, the Priſcillianiſts were famous for their auſterity and mortifications, and therefore were probably the ſame perſons whom Philaſter calls *Abſtinentes*, in Gaul, Spain, and Aquitain. With reſpect to the perſon of Chriſt, Auſtin ſays that they agreed with Sabellius, and Pope Leo, who was their bitter enemy, ſays that they had drawn

in

in the poiſon of Paul of Samoſata and Photinus.

It was in a ſynod at Bracara (Braga) the metropolis of Gallicia in Spain, which was called for the purpoſe of condemning the Priſcillianiſts, that the addition of *filioque* (*and to the Son*) which afterwards was the great bone of contention between the Eaſtern and Weſtern churches, was firſt introduced into the Conſtantinopolitan creed. The biſhops who were aſſembled on this occaſion, in repeating the creed of this council, inſtead of contenting themſelves with ſaying, according to it, that the Holy Spirit proceedeth *from the Father* ſaid, who proceedeth *from the Father and the Son;* being led to it, it is ſuppoſed, by ſomething which approached to it in an epiſtle which Pope Leo addreſſed to them.

The Viſigoths, who were catholics, received this addition, and it was admitted in the councils of Toledo. It alſo paſſed into Gaul, as we learn by the ſynod of Arles held under Charlemain. The church of Rome did not receive the creed with this addition till a long time afterwards, by Nicholas the firſt according to ſome, and Sergius III. according to others. But Baronius ſays it was done by Benedict

Benedict VII. who, at the requeſt of the emperor Henry, ordered the creed to be ſung in the church of Rome with this addition, after the goſpel, as it had been uſually ſung in the Weſt.

This addition to the creed was the principal cauſe of the ſchiſm between the Greek and the Latin churches; the former complaining, and ſeemingly with reaſon, that the Latins made this addition to the creed without the authority of a general council *. This is one remarkable inſtance of great effects ariſing from ſmall cauſes; but all hiſtory, civil as well as eccleſiaſtical, abounds with them. Trifling as this circumſtance of the addition to the creed may be thought, it is of as much importance as any thing that was decided at the general councils of Epheſus, or Chalcedon.

That the Priſcillianiſts were not, in all reſpects Gnoſtics or Manichæans is evident from their receiving, according to Auſtin, all the books of ſcripture, even the apocryphal ones, though he ſays they miſinterpreted or perverted them †.

* Sueur, A. D. 447.
† Hiſt. of Early Opinions, Vol. iv. p. 265.

Of

Of the Unitarians.

We hear very little of any Unitarians in this reign, there is however, an account of Bonoſus a biſhop in Macedonia, who was accuſed of the hereſy of Photinus, and likewiſe of maintaining that Mary the mother of Jeſus had commerce with her huſband Joſeph after his birth. Nyſius of Theſſalonica, and other neighbouring biſhops, taking the affair into conſideration, they condemned Bonoſus, and forbade thoſe who had been ordained by him to hold any communion with him. Mention is alſo made of Bonoſians, who were Photinians*, in a council at Arles, held in the time of pope Siricius, i. e. between A. D. 385 and A. D. 394.

SECTION VII.

Of the Arians and Novatians in this Reign.

IN this reign the Arians were much divided among themſelves, the Eunomians as well as the other denominations of Arians. Euno-

* Binnii Concilia, Tom. I. P. i. p. 564. Le Sueur. A. D. 389.

mius

mius himſelf, while he lived in Conſtantinople, performed divine ſervice in the ſuburbs of that city, or in private houſes within it. In this ſituation he wrote many books, and had many followers; ſo that in a ſhort time his diſciples in that place and neighbourhood were very numerous. On this account he was baniſhed to Chalcedon, where, according to Philoſtorgius, he lived in a garden near the walls of the city. This however was not found to be ſufficient; for Theodoſius, having diſcovered that ſome perſons in his court had adopted the opinions of Eunomius, not only baniſhed them from his palace, but ſent Eunomius himſelf from Chalcedon to Halmyris in Mæſia upon the Danube.

But this place being ſoon afterwards taken by the barbarians, he was baniſhed to Cæſarea in Cappadocia, and as he had formerly written againſt Baſil the biſhop of that city, he was permitted to live on an eſtate of his own in Dacoroeni, where Philoſtorgius ſays that himſelf, when he was twenty years of age, ſaw him. He deſcribes him as a man of a moſt engaging perſon and addreſs, as well as extraordinary genius. He was, I doubt not, a man of excellent character, as well of great ability. This writer ſays that neither Aetius

nor Eunomius officiated as biſhops, though they were conſidered as the heads of all the biſhops of their perſuaſion. Eunomius, he ſays, never adminiſtered the lord's ſupper after he left Cyzicum*.

Having mentioned theſe particulars concerning Eunomius, it may not be amiſs to place here what Philoſtorgius ſays concerning the end of Aetius. When he left Conſtantinople, he retired to Leſbos, where he lived on an eſtate which Julian gave him in the neighbourhood of Mitelene. Being accuſed to Procopius of taking the part of Valens, it was with difficulty that he eſcaped death during that uſurpation. After this he lived with Eunomiusand Florinus at Conſtantinople, and not long after died, Eunomius himſelf cloſing his eyes †.

Eunomius was ſucceeded by Theophronius, a Cappadocian, as Eunomius himſelf was. Being converſant in the philoſophy of Ariſtotle, he maintained that as things changed from being *future*, to the *preſent*, and from that to the *paſt*, the divine being himſelf, as to his knowledge, muſt change alſo. But his hear-

* Philoſtorgii Hiſt. Lib. ix. Cap. 4. p. 527. Lib. x. Cap. vi. p. 534.

† Philoſtorgii Hiſt. Lib. ix. Cap. 3. 6. p. 527, 528.

ers,

ers, being offended at this doctrine, expelled him from their church, and after this he had disciples who bore his own name.

Not long after Eutychius, another Eunomian, maintaining that since Christ had all things delivered to him from the Father, he must know even the day of judgment, and others of the sect not approving of this opinion, he left them, and went to Eunomius (who was said to approve of his sentiment) a short time before his death. But he who had in the mean time been made bishop of the Eunomians at Constantinople, not receiving Eutychus upon his return, he also formed a sect of his own. And some say it was not Eunomius himself, but either Theophronius, or this Eutychius, who changed the form of baptism, from being administered in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, into that of *the death of Christ*.

About the same time the Arians of Constantinople, who were not of the sect of Eunomius, disputed among themselves whether God could be called *a father* before the production of the Son, Marinus maintaining the affirmative, and Dorotheus from Antioch, the negative; and as Dorotheus kept possession of the ancient church, the followers of Marinus

formed ſeparate congregations. Selina the Arian biſhop of the Goths, and the ſucceſſor of Ulphilas, was of his party. After this many of the Arians, taking offence, joined the catholic church. But after the diviſion had continued fifty years at Conſtantinople, the two parties united, having agreed that they would never have any more controverſy on this ſubject*.

In this reign alſo, the Novatians were divided upon the ſubject of keeping Eaſter, ſome of them following Sabbatius, who having been a Jewiſh convert adhered to the Jewiſh cuſtom of celebrating this feſtival, on the fourteenth day of the month, and were called *Sabbatians*; while the reſt of the Novatians conformed to the cuſtom of other chriſtians in this reſpect. The followers of Sabbatius were chiefly from Phrygia and Gallatia†.

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. vii. Cap. 17. p. 301. Socratis Hiſt. Lib. v. Cap. 23, 24. p. 300, &c.

† Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. vii. Cap. 18. p. 304. Socratis Hiſt. Lib. v. Cap. 21. p. 289.

SECT.

SECTION VIII.

Of the Donatiſts in this Reign.

CONSIDERING how numerous the Donatiſts were, we cannot be much ſurprized to find them, like other numerous ſects, divided among themſelves, as they were in this reign.

On the death of Parmenian, their biſhop, of Carthage, they met at Bagaia to chuſe a ſucceſſor to him, when there were two competitors, Primianus, who is ſaid to have been the more zealous Donatiſt, and Maximianus, a relation of the famous Donatus. The majority; were for Primianus; but the friends of Maximianus, conſiſting of forty three biſhops, were diſſatisfied with the election, and formed ſeparate congregations.

At another meeting, held at Cuburſuſſita a hundred biſhops appeared on the ſide of Maximianus; but ſtill they were inferior in number to the partizans of Primianus; and at a third ſynod, held at Bagaia, three hun-

dred biſhops reſcinded all that had been done in favour of Maximianus; and, as Auſtin ſays, they availed themſelves of the imperial laws againſt ſuch as divided their church. This, however, was probably in argument only, as the imperial officers would hardly allow thoſe who were deemed ſectaries themſelves the benefit of laws enacted againſt ſectaries.

The Maximianiſts themſelves, though the ſmaller party, were afterwards divided into two others, viz. the Rogatians and the Claudianiſts. Theſe diviſions ſeem to have reſpected the heads of the party only, and not any matter of doctrine or diſcipline *.

* Long's Hiſtory of the Donatiſts, p. 80.

SECT.

SECTION IX.

Of the Variety of Cuſtoms among Chriſtians in this Period.

SOCRATES, on occaſion of mentioning the preceding difference among the Novatians with reſpect to the time of celebrating Eaſter, proceeds to give an account of other varieties in the cuſtoms of chriſtians, in this period, and in times preceding it, which is extremely curious, and abundantly juſtifies his inference, that the unity of the church ought not to be broken for the ſake of ſuch differences. I ſhall therefore recite the principal of his obſervations.

"The faſt which precedes the feſtival of "Eaſter is obſerved differently in different "churches. At Rome they faſt three whole "weeks before Eaſter, excepting Saturday "and Sunday; but in Illyricum, all Achaia, "and Alexandria, they faſt ſix weeks, and "call it *Quadrageſſima*" (our *Lent*) "others "however begin the faſt on the ſeventh week "before Eaſter, and though they faſt only "three of theſe weeks, faſting only five days

" in each, they ſtill call it *Quadrageſſima*, the " reaſon of which I do not underſtand.

" Nor do chriſtians differ only in the num- " ber of faſting days, but alſo in the man- " ner of faſting. For ſome abſtain from all " animal food, others eat fiſh only, and ſome " fowls as well as fiſh, ſaying that, according " to Moſes, they alſo were produced out of " the water. Some abſtain from all fruits, and " from eggs. Some live on bread only, and " others abſtain even from that. Some faſt " till the ninth hour, but after that eat all " kinds of food without diſtinction. Other " ſtill different rules are obſerved in different " places, and innumerable reaſons are pro- " duced for them; but ſince there is no ſcrip- " ture precept on the ſubject, it is plain that " the apoſtles left all perſons at their intire " liberty in theſe reſpects."

" There is no leſs difference in the cuſtoms " relating to public worſhip. For whereas " all other churches receive the communion " on Saturday, thoſe of Alexandria and " Rome, following ſome ancient tradition, " refuſe to do it. But the Egyptians in the " neighbourhood of Alexandria, and alſo " thoſe of Thebais, have indeed aſſemblies " for public worſhip on Saturday, but do not

" receive

" receive the communion as other chriſtians " do, for after having feaſted on all kinds of " food, they receive the communion in the " evening. Moreover, at Alexandria, the " ſcriptures are read and explained on the " Wedneſday and Friday, and every thing is " done as in time of public worſhip, except " the celebration of the euchariſt. And this " is a very ancient cuſtom of the church of " Alexandria; for it appears that Origen gave " lectures on thoſe days."

" In Alexandria alſo the readers and the " ſingers are taken without diſtinction from " among the catechumens, or the complete " chriſtians, whereas all other churches admit " no catechumens to that rank."

" I have obſerved alſo another peculiar cuſ- " tom in Theſſaly. If any of the clergy there " ſleep with his wife to whom he was lawful- " ly married before his preferment, he is de- " poſed; whereas in the Eaſt all the clergy, " and even the biſhops, are left at their full li- " berty in this reſpect; for many of them have " children while they are biſhops. The per- " ſon who introduced this cuſtom into Theſ- " ſaly was Heliodorus biſhop of Trica in that " country, the ſame who, when he was a

" young man wrote the *Æthiopics*. The ſame
" cuſtom alſo paſſed to Theſſalonica, Mace-
" donia and Achaia."

" In Theſſaly they baptize only at Eaſter,
" ſo that there many die without baptiſm.
" At Antioch in Syria the ſituation of the
" churches is the reverſe of what it is in other
" places, for the altar is not placed at the
" Eaſt, but at the Weſt end of them."

" In Achaia, Theſſaly, and Jeruſalem,
" prayers are made when the candles are
" lighted, according to the practice of the
" Novatians at Conſtantinople. At Cæſarea
" in Cappadocia, and at Cyprus, the bi-
" ſhops and preſbyters always interpret the
" ſcriptures in the evening of Saturday and
" Sunday after the candles are lighted. The
" Novatians in the neighbourhood of the
" Helleſpont do not pray in the ſame manner
" as thoſe at Conſtantinople. In moſt of their
" churches, however, they conform to the
" cuſtom of the catholic church. Upon the
" whole, you will hardly find two churches
" in all the ſects which exactly agree with re-
" ſpect to their prayers."

" At Alexandria no preſbyter preaches, a
" cuſtom which was introduced there after

Arius

"Arius had made ſo great a diſturbance in "that church. At Rome they faſt every Sa- "turday. At Cæſarea in Cappadocia they "excommunicate all who ſin after baptiſm, "juſt as the Novatians do. The ſame is done "by the Macedonians on the Helleſpont, and "the Quartodecimans in Aſia. The Nova- "tians in Phrygia do not admit to their com- "munion thoſe who have married two wives. "Thoſe of Conſtantinople neither openly re- "ceive nor openly reject them, but in the "Weſt they openly receive them. Theſe "differences in my opinion aroſe from the "biſhops in different churches, whoſe pecu- "liar cuſtoms have been tranſmitted as a law "to poſterity*."

Sozomen mentions ſeveral of theſe varieties in the cuſtoms of different churches, and likewiſe other peculiarities with reſpect to diſcipline at this period, among which are the following.

"In the province of Scythia, though there "are many cities, there is but one biſhop; "whereas in other provinces even villages "have regularly conſecrated biſhops, as in "Arabia, Cyprus, and among the Novatians

* Lib. v. Cap. 22. p. 294.

" and Montaniſts in Phrygia. At Rome
" there are no more than ſeven deacons, after
" the example of thoſe who were appointed
" by the apoſtles; but in other churches the
" number of deacons is not limited. At Rome
" they ſing the Hallelujah only once a year, on
" Eaſter Sunday; ſo that many of the Romans
" make uſe of it as a kind of oath, ſaying
" *may they live to hear or ſing that hymn.*

" In the church of Alexandria there is this
" peculiarity, that the biſhop doth not ſtand
" up while the goſpels are read, a thing which
" I never ſaw or heard of in any other place.
" There alſo the archdeacon only reads that
" ſacred book, in other churches the deacons.
" In many churches the preſbyters only read,
" in others, on the principal feſtivals the bi-
" ſhops themſelves read, as on Eaſter Sun-
" day at Conſtantinople."

" The ſame cuſtom is not obſerved in all
" places with reſpect to prayers, pſalms, and
" the books that are read in the time of pub-
" lic worſhip. *The revelation of Peter*, which
" is rejected as a ſpurious book by the anci-
" ents, is read once every year in ſome
" churches in Paleſtine on Good Friday,
" which is a religious faſt in commemoration
" of

" of our Lord's ſufferings. The book that is " called the *revelation of the Apoſtle Paul*, which " was unknown to the ancients, is greatly " commended by many of the monks. Some " ſay that this book was firſt found in the " reign of Theodoſius. For they ſay that in " the houſe of Paul at Tarſus, there was a " marble cheſt in a ſubterraneous place, in " which this book was depoſited, and, that it " was diſcovered by a particular revelation. " But when I made inquiry concerning it, I " was informed by an old preſbyter of the " church of Tarſus that he had never heard " of any ſuch thing, and that he ſuſpected " it to be a fiction of the heretics*."

I mention this laſt circumſtance as a ſpecimen of the manner in which relics, and other remains of antiquity, were commonly ſaid to be diſcovered in this age, that the reader may judge how little credit is due to them.

Happy would it have been for the chriſtian church, if particular *opinions* had been allowed to be held, with as little cenſure as theſe peculiar *practices*, and if nothing but good morals had been deemed eſſential to chriſtian com-

* Lib. vii. Cap. 19. p. 307.

munion.

munion. But inſtead of improving in liberality, the terms of church communion were continually made ſtricter than before, till at length no variation even in rites and ceremonies would be allowed. Much ground muſt be meaſured back again before we recover the ſimplicity of the apoſtolic age.

SECTION X.

Of a Change in the Diſcipline of the Eaſtern Churches in this Reign.

A Conſiderable change was made in the interior diſcipline of the church of Conſtantinople, and afterwards in the Eaſtern churches in general, in this reign, by diſcontinuing the office of *penitentiary preſbyter*, whoſe buſineſs it had been to direct every thing that related to confeſſion and penance. Before this time there had been ſuch an officer in every church, and, to appearance, the cuſtom was an uſeful one. For, as Sozomen obſerves,

obſerves, ſince no perſon who had been excommunicated could be received into the church without confeſſing the ſins for which he had been excluded, it appeared too hard to oblige every perſon to make ſuch a confeſſion before the whole choir of preſbyters, and therefore choice had been made of one of the moſt diſcreet of them to hear ſuch confeſſions. This regulation had been made among all the ſects of chriſtians except the Novatians, who received none into their communion after they had been once excommunicated. Alſo this office of penitentiary preſbyter was ſtill kept up in all the ſects of chriſtians except the catholics of the Eaſt, by whom it was diſcontinued, on the following occaſion.

In the time of Nectarius, a woman of good condition, having been excommunicated for ſome offence or other, applied as uſual to the penitentiary preſbyter, and he had recommended to her faſting, and frequent prayer; and for this the church, as among the catholics at this day, appears to have been conſidered as the moſt proper place. After ſome time ſhe confeſſed that, beſides the fault for which ſhe had been injoined this penance, a deacon had criminal converſation with her while ſhe

was

was performing her penance in the church itſelf. Upon this the deacon was excommunicated, and the people were ſo much diſturbed at the ſcandal which this affair brought upon the whole ſociety, that the biſhop thought proper to aboliſh the office of penitentiary preſbyter, and left all perſons who had been excommunicated to come to communion as they ſhould judge themſelves to be fit for it; and this example was followed by almoſt all other churches, except that of Rome.

This account, Socrates ſays he had from Eudemon, the perſon who gave this advice to Nectarius; but he expreſſes much doubt whether the alteration had been favourable to the diſcipline of the church. Sozomen ſays that offences were much increaſed afterwards, and that for this reaſon he approved of the law of Theodoſius, which excluded all women from any office in the church, unleſs they had children, and were ſixty years old, which ordered that women whoſe hair was ſhorn ſhould be refuſed admittance into the churches, and that the biſhops who ſuffered them to enter ſhould be depoſed.

The cuſtom had been for the penitents to ſtand in a place by themſelves, with all the marks

marks of ſorrow and contrition, often with their faces to the ground. Out of compaſſion to their ſituation, the biſhops and others ſometimes joined with them in this mode of proſtration, praying with them and for them; and the cuſtom was, that when, after this proſtration, the biſhop got up, the penitents roſe alſo. He then diſmiſſed them with a prayer, and when they had performed the penance which he injoined they were received into communion *.

SECTION XI.

Of the Ornaments of Churches, and of Feſtivals, and the increaſe of Superſtition in this Period.

WE ſee in the works of Gregory biſhop of Niſſa, a writer of this age, that it was the cuſtom to ornament their churches in the Eaſt with pictures, and even ſtatues, repreſenting the acts of the martyrs, and other things which it was thought would

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. v. Cap. 19. p. 287. Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. vii. Cap. 16. p. 299.

make

make a good impreſſion on the ſpectators. In his oration on Theodore the martyr, he ſays, "When we come into a place like "this, in which we are now aſſembled, "in which are the memorials and ſa- "cred relics of the ſaints, we are firſt delight- "ed with the magnificence and ornaments of "the temple of God; where the artiſt has "formed wood into the figures of animals, "and has given to ſtone the poliſh of ſilver; "where the painter has deſcribed to the life "the heroic acts of the martyrs, and the "frightful form of the tyrants, the fiery fur- "nace, and the glorious triumph of the wreſt- "lers, the figure of Chriſt in an human "form preſiding over the conteſt; deſcribing "every thing as in a book, underſtood by all. "For the ſilent picture upon the wall may be "ſaid to ſpeak, and inſtruct. Hiſtories are "alſo drawn upon the pavement of the "floor, that we tread upon, &c. *"

It is probable that this mode of ornamenting churches began as early as the reign of Conſtantine; and had it proceeded no farther, the practice would not have been liable to any cenſure. There was no religious worſhip then paid to theſe images, they exer-

* Opera Vol. ii. p. 1011.

ciſed

ciſed the ingenuity of the artiſt, they gave pleaſure to perſons of taſte, and they inſtructed thoſe who could not read. It was alſo an innocent method of drawing the heathens from their temples, which were ornamented in a ſimilar manner, to the chriſtian churches.

But, alas! with the ſame good intentions, ſome of the zealous chriſtians of this age took ſome unwarrantable ſteps, ſuch at leaſt as ſoon drew after them conſequences highly unfavourable to genuine chriſtianity. With a view to draw men off from the rites of the heathen religion, they provided many of the ſame indulgences for them under the name of chriſtianity. Thus, though they pretended to ſuppreſs the heathen feſtivals, they allowed the ſame amuſements, and gratifications, ſuch as feaſting, and every expreſſion of joy not properly vicious, at the ſame time, and in the ſame places; but telling the people it was not now done as formerly, in honour of ſome heathen God, but of a chriſtian ſaint. This practice is avowed by this Gregory of Niſſa, and is by him aſcribed to Gregory of Neocæſarea, in a much earlier period. Whoever formed this idea, and however innocent it might be in the firſt conception of it (which I am very far from being diſpoſed to deny)

deny) it had very unhappy conſequences. For this imitation of paganiſm brought in at length a ſyſtem of worſhip which differed but little from the former, and defeated much of the good moral tendency of chriſtianity.

There was a very great increaſe of the profeſſion of chriſtianity in this reign, much of which, I doubt not, was the effect of conviction; but too much of it is to be aſcribed to this kind of artifice, and a good deal to open force.

Superſtition of various kinds kept increaſing in this as in the preceding reign, and eſpecially that of conveying dead bodies and relics of ſaints from place to place. This grew to ſo great an height, that in A. D. 386, Theodoſius made a law to forbid the removal of any body that had once been buried, to make any diſtinction between one martyr and another, or to make a traffic of their relics. People were allowed, however, to ſhew what marks of reſpect they pleaſed to their ſaints at the places where they had been buried, and to erect what buildings they thought proper upon them. But the demand for relics was ſo great, that no law could reſtrain a traffic in them. It was commonly pretended that the place where the bones, &c. of any ancient

martyr were hid was discovered by a vision, and the general credulity in this case made very slight degrees of evidence suffice*.

The prayer of Ambrose for Theodosius after his death, shews what was the current opinion concerning the state of the dead in this period. He speaks of him as in the company of the saints, and particularly as embracing Gratian, whose death he had revenged, which as Sueur observes, is by no means a state of purgatory. He then prays that God would give him that rest which he had prepared for his saints, and that his soul might return from the place whither it was descended, where it could not feel the stings of death. In his idea, therefore, the souls of good men were in *hades*, a place under ground, and not in *heaven* with God and Christ. "I have loved "him," says he, "and will not leave him "till I have conducted him to the place where "his merits call him, where life is perpe-"tual, where there is no contagion of corrup-"tion, no groaning, or crying, where this mor-"tal shall be cloathed with immortality, and "this corruptible shall put on incorruption." This looks as if Ambrose hoped that by

* Sueur, A. D. 386.

his prayers he might remove Theodoſius from his place in hades, into heaven, where the martyrs were at that time generally ſuppoſed to be*. Tertullian is the firſt who ſpeaks of prayers for the dead†.

* Dilexi, et ideo proſequor eum uſque ad regionem vivorum, nec deſeram, donec fletis et precibus inducam virum quo ſua merita vocant, in montem domini ſanctum, ubi perennis vita, ubi corruptelæ nulla contagio, nullus gemitus, nullus dolor, nulla conſortia mortuorum, vera regio viventium, ubi mortale hoc induat immortalitatem, et corruptibile hoc induat incorruptionem. Oratio funebris pro Theodoſio, Ambroſii, Opera Vol. v. p. 122.

† De Corona, Cap. iii. Opera p. 102.

PERIOD

PERIOD XII.

FROM THE DEATH OF THEODOSIUS, A. D. 395, TO THAT OF HONORIUS, A. D. 424.

SECTION I.

From the Acceſſion of Arcadius, A. D. 395, to the Depoſition of Chryſoſtom, A. D. 403.

AFTER the death of Theodoſius, his ſon Arcadius, on whom devolved the government of the Eaſt, returned to Conſtantinople, and Rufinus the præfect of the prætorian guards being put to death on ſuſpicion of treaſon, Eutropius the eunuch ſucceeded to his power, which, as the prince was weak, was in a manner unbounded; but abuſing his authority, he alſo was afterwards put to death.

Sozomen gives the following account of the ſtate of religion at the beginning of this

reign. The two emperors confirmed all that their father had done in favour of the Conſubſtantialiſts, and added much of themſelves to the encouragement which he had given them; and the ſubjects imitating their princes, many of the heathens came over to the chriſtian religion, and heretics to the catholic church. The number of Arians and Eunomians continually diminiſhed, chiefly on account of their differences among themſelves; but the Novatians retained their privileges, and derived much credit from the ability, the learning, and the exemplary conduct of their biſhops, particularly Siſinius of Conſtantinople; who is ſpoken of as a perſon highly accompliſhed, both as a ſcholar, and a man of the world*.

Nectarius biſhop of Conſtantinople dying about this time, the great reputation of John, a preſbyter of Antioch (who afterwards for his eloquence obtained the name of *Chryſoſtom*, and whoſe hiſtory will make a great part of that of this reign) induced both the prince and the people to make choice of him for his ſucceſſor; though Theophilus biſhop of Alexandria envied him that elevation, and wiſhed to have a

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. viii. Cap. 1. p. 323. Socratis Hiſt. Lib. vi. Cap. 22. p. 340.

preſbyter

preſbyter of his own church raiſed to that dignity.

Chryſoſtom was a native of Antioch, originally deſigned for the bar; but being diſguſted with that profeſſion, he applied himſelf to ſacred literature, and perſuaded two of his friends, Theodorus and Maximus, who had attended the lectures of Libanius along with him, to do the ſame. Afterwards, this Theodorus was made biſhop of Mopſueſtia, and became famous as the maſter of Neſtorius. Maximus was biſhop of Seleucia in Iſauria. But before their elevation to theſe biſhoprics they had led a monaſtic life under Diodorus and Carterius, of whom the former was afterwards advanced to the biſhopric of Tarſus, and wrote many books, in which he explained the ſcriptures in their obvious and literal ſenſe. He is alſo ſaid to have held that opinion which was afterwards called Neſtorianiſm, and to have taught it to Theodorus, as the latter did to Neſtorius himſelf.

While Chryſoſtom was at Antioch, he wrote ſeveral of his books, as well as acquired great reputation by his eloquent preaching. He was a man of great ſimplicity of character, ſeverity of manners, and freedom of ſpeech,

which brought him many enemies*. His whole hiſtory ſhews that, notwithſtanding his great virtues, he was very haughty and arbitrary.

This temper, and theſe manners, which led him to be very ſtrict with his clergy, and to depoſe many of them, ſoon created him enemies in his own church; and he alſo made himſelf enemies at court, both by his uncompliant temper, and his invectives againſt Eutropius, who was over the bed-chamber, and Gainas the Goth, who was maſter of the horſe. The former had offended him by petitioning for a law to take offenders from the churches in which they took ſanctuary, and the latter by propoſing that the Arians, of whom he was one, might have the uſe of one of the churches within the city. He alſo gave offence to other courtiers. But his greateſt enemy, after ſome time was the empreſs Eudoxia, and with reſpect to her Chryſoſtom certainly behaved very improperly †.

Chryſoſtom's moſt faithful adherents were the people, with whom his eloquence made him amazingly popular. Indeed, people of all ranks crouded to hear him; and by

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. vi. Cap. 1, 2, 3. p. 308. &c.
† Ibid. Cap. v. p. 314.

this

his means many of the pagans became converts to chriſtianity, and many ſectaries were brought over to the catholic church. It would have been well if this eloquent preacher had confined himſelf to this mode of making converts; but he made no ſcruple of having recourſe to others, which leſs became a chriſtian biſhop. In a very harſh manner he threatened Siſinius the Novatian biſhop of Conſtantinople, that he would take his church from him. But being a man of the moſt pleaſing manners, and a great favourite at court, as on every account he deſerved to be, and as the Novatians were protected by the laws, it was not in the power of this imperious biſhop to carry his threats into execution*. The Arians were more in his power, though we have no account of any particular violence that he was guilty of with reſpect to them.

Chryſoſtom did not confine his attention to the city of which he was biſhop, but alſo took ſtrict cognizance of every thing within his dioceſe, as a metropolitan; and there being much corruption, and many abuſes in the churches, he expelled from their ſees no leſs than thirteen biſhops in the neighbourhood of

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. vi. Cap. 22. p. 341.

Epheſus only, and alſo the biſhop of Nicomedia, and put others in their places. He was, however, blamed by many for his behaviour on this occaſion, as he deprived many of the Novatians, with whom he had no buſineſs, and alſo the Quartodecimans, of their churches; and for making Heraclides, one of his own preſbyters, biſhop of Epheſus, he being generally thought to be unworthy of that honour. By doing what he thought to be his duty in theſe caſes, but in a more arbitrary manner, and with more ſeverity, than became him, he made himſelf ſtill more enemies; and they now began openly to accuſe him of exceeding the bounds of his authority *.

He was particularly accuſed of cruelty in inveighing againſt Eutropius, as he lay under the communion table of the church, in which he had taken refuge, when he was out of favour at court, and thought his life in danger; the biſhop having taken this opportunity of making an harangue to the people, in which he declaimed againſt the inſolence of the great, and of the inſtability of all

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. vi. Cap. 19. p. 338. Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. viii. Cap. 6. p. 333.

human

human power*. He particularly drew upon himſelf the ill offices of Serapion his archdeacon, who was a proud and quarrelſome man; of Olympias a rich young widow, who had been made deaconeſs, but whom he reproved for making an improper diſtribution of her wealth, and of the monks in general, many of whom he reproached for leaving their monaſteries, and coming abroad into the world unneceſſarily. All theſe joined in taking every opportunity of cenſuring him, and among other things for never going to any entertainment, but always eating by himſelf, which they attributed to pride, but his friends to the particular attention that he was obliged to give to his diet, in conſequence of his weak conſtitution, and the intenſity of his ſtudies †.

Chryſoſtom had alſo a quarrel with Severianus biſhop of Gabala in Syria, of whom he himſelf had been very fond, and to whom he had committed the care of his church when he went on his progreſs through Aſia, and alſo with Antiochus biſhop of Ptolemais, who on ſome occaſion had come to Conſtantinople. But both theſe men had acquired

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. viii. Cap. 8. p. 336.
† Ibid. Cap. ix. p. 337.

great

great reputation as preachers, ſo as in ſome meaſure to rival Chryſoſtom in what he moſt excelled, and no doubt prided himſelf in. Serapion contributed much to inflame this quarrel with Severianus. The latter being much admired by the emperor and empreſs, this quarrel gave them much diſturbance, and the empreſs herſelf condeſcended to interpoſe between them; and at length by her earneſt intreaties, in which ſhe placed her young child Theodoſius on the knees of Chryſoſtom in the church of the apoſtles, ſhe in ſome meaſure ſucceeded *.

Chryſoſtom was not a little hurt in conſequence of a controverſy between his adverſary Theophilus biſhop of Alexandria and the monks of Egypt; of which, for this and other reaſons, being one of the moſt important circumſtances in the eccleſiaſtical hiſtory of this period, it will be neceſſary to give an account.

The more ignorant of theſe monks, who were a great majority of them, maintained that God was corporeal, and had the form of man; hearing with real ears, and ſeeing with real eyes, as he is repreſented in the popular

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. viii. Cap. 10. p. 338. Socratis Hiſt. Lib. vi. Cap. 10. p. 325.

language

language of the ſcriptures. Theophilus the biſhop of Alexandria, in a paſchal letter, (which it appears to have been the cuſtom of the biſhops of that city to write annually) condemned this opinion. But the monks thereupon coming in crowds to the city, and threatening his life, he diſſembled with them, and made them believe that he was of their opinion; and when they required him to condemn the books of Origen, which they ſaid were unfavourable to it, he aſſured them that he was as much diſpleaſed with the opinions of Origen as they were*.

This buſineſs might have ended here, had it not been for the animoſity which Theophilus had conceived againſt four brothers, whoſe names were Ammonius, Dioſcorus, Euſebius, and Euthymius (who for their ſize were commonly called *the tall*) to whom he had been much attached, and whom he thought ungrateful. One of theſe, viz. Dioſcorus, he had made a biſhop, but the other three, notwithſtanding his earneſt remonſtrances, would leave him, and follow the monaſtic life as they had done before he invited them to Alexandria. In order to do theſe

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. viii. Cap. 11. p. 340.

men an injury, it is ſaid that Theophilus accuſed them to their friends of being favourers of the opinions of Origen, and believing God to be incorporeal. This excited almoſt a civil war among the monks, who had little to do but to diſpute; and by them were firſt introduced the two appellations of *Origeniſts* on the one hand, and *Anthropomorphites* on the other, both being uſed as terms of reproach*.

At length Dioſcorus, Ammonius, and about eighty more of the monks, having ſeen through the malice of Theophilus, left Egypt, and went firſt to Jeruſalem, and thence to Scythopolis; thinking that place a convenient retreat, as it abounded with palm trees, the leaves of which the monks made uſe of in their manufactories. But Theophilus having ſent to Conſtantinople to do them all the ill offices in his power, Ammonius and his friends went thither alſo, accompained by Iſidorus from the church of Alexandria, to complain of Theophilus. Chryſoſtom received theſe monks very kindly, and though he did not admit them to communion, yet as he had heard no accuſation againſt them,

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. viii. Cap. 12. p. 341. Socratis Hiſt. Lib. vi. Cap. 7. p. 319.

he

he permitted them to pray in his church. He alſo wrote to Theophilus in their favour, deſiring him either to reſtore them to his communion, as perſons who thought juſtly concerning God, or elſe to ſend ſome perſon properly authorized to accuſe them. But to this Theophilus made no reply.

Some time after this Ammonius and his friends complained to the empreſs of the ill uſage of Theophilus, and ſhe received them very graciouſly, promiſing that a ſynod ſhould ſoon be called, and that juſtice ſhould be done them. This being reported at Alexandria, with the addition, which was not true, that Chryſoſtom had received the monks into his communion, Theophilus was more than ever inflamed againſt him; and from this time it is ſaid that he formed a plan to eject him from his ſee*

Carefully concealing his deſigns, Theophilus for the preſent only wrote to the diſtant metropolitans, requeſting that they would join him in cenſuring the works of Origen. Epiphanius the metropolitan biſhop of Cyprus entered into his meaſures, and having called a ſynod of the biſhops of that iſland paſſed a regular cenſure upon Origen, but up-

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. viii. Cap. 13. p. 342.

on

on what account is not ſaid. It is not, however, at all probable that he, or any of the biſhops of this age, would take part with the monks of Egypt, and condemn the works of this great man becauſe he ſuppoſed God to be incorporeal.

When Theophilus heard what had been done in Cyprus, he alſo called a ſynod of his biſhops, and did the ſame in Egypt. But Chryſoſtom paid no attention to what they had done, which gave great offence to theſe two metropolitans; and his own clergy, perceiving that ſomething was in agitation againſt their biſhop, with whom they were on very bad terms, did every thing in their power towards calling a council on the ſubject, which accordingly ſeems to have been ſummoned; and on this buſineſs Epiphanius went to Conſtantinople, and Theophilus, having ſent the biſhops of his dioceſe before him, followed leiſurely himſelf*.

Epiphanius, while he was at Conſtantinople on this buſineſs, declined having any communication with Chryſoſtom; and conferring privately with the other biſhops, urged upon them the neceſſity of condemning the works of Origen, and excommunicating Dioſcorus

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. vi. Cap. 9, 10. p. 323, 324.

and

and his companions. But partly through the remonſtrances of the other biſhops in favour of Origen, and partly through the civilities of Dioſcorus and his friends to himſelf, he became ſenſible of the impropriety of his conduct, and left the city; but he died before he reached Cyprus*.

At this critical time Chryſoſtom unfortunately drew upon him the indignation of the empreſs by an invective againſt women, in which he was thought to allude to the empreſs herſelf; having been offended at her, on the idea, whether juſt or not, that ſhe had taken part with Epiphanius and others againſt him, and that when her ſon was ſick, ſhe had employed Epiphanius to pray for him. In this ſtate of things the biſhops aſſembled at Chalcedon, where Cyrinus, a friend of Theophilus was biſhop; and there the enemies of Chryſoſtom being the majority, and he not chuſing to obey their ſummons, but appealing to a more general council, a ſentence of depoſition was pronounced againſt him. At the ſame time Theophilus behaving kindly to the monks, and receiving them into his communion, they made no complaints againſt him, nor was any thing ſaid about the works

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. viii. Cap. 14, 15. p. 344. Socratis Hiſt. Lib. vi. Cap. 14. p. 329.

of

of Origen. This was the more eaſily managed, as Dioſcorus had died juſt before, and Ammonius was ſick at the time of holding this council*.

SECTION II.

From the Depoſition of Chryſoſtom A. D. 403, to his Death, A. D. 407, and that of Arcadius, A. D. 408.

THE people of Conſtantinople, hearing of what had paſſed at Chalcedon, were ſo tumultuous, that it was with great difficulty that Chryſoſtom could obey the order of the council, ſo as to withdraw from the city privately. After this the people aſſembling from all places, and crowding to the palace, the emperor could not reſiſt their importunity to have their biſhop recalled. Accordingly an order was iſſued for the purpoſe, and notwithſtanding all the remonſtrances of Chryſoſtom, that he ought not to return to his ſee till thoſe who had depoſed ſhould be

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. viii. Cap. 17. p. 347. Socratis Hiſt. Lib. vi. Cap. 15. p. 331.

brought

brought to reinſtate him, he was obliged to reſume the epiſcopal functions. At the ſame time the ſailors, and other perſons from Egypt, taking part with their biſhop, and the people of Conſtantinople with theirs, both ſides had recourſe to arms; and many were wounded, and ſome killed, in conſequence of which Theophilus left the city, and returned to Egypt. After this a ſynod of about ſixty biſhops aſſembled at Conſtantinople, and reſcinded all that had been done againſt Chryſoſtom at Chalcedon *.

Chryſoſtom, confiding perhaps in his popularity, and irritated againſt the empreſs, gave way to the natural vehemence of his temper on occaſion of a ſtatue of her being erected on the ſouth ſide of a church, juſt before the ſenate houſe, and the pompous ceremonies with which it was placed there; all which he ſaid was done in contempt of the church, and accordingly he exclaimed againſt it in his ſermons. This the empreſs took ſo ill, that ſhe endeavoured to call another ſynod. But the biſhop was ſo far from being intimidated, that he reproached her for her conduct more openly than ever, calling her

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. viii. Cap. 18, 19. p. 348, 350. Socratis Hiſt. Lib. vi. Cap. 16, 17. p. 332, 334.

another Herodias, who wiſhed to have the head of another John, meaning his own, in a charger. Such language as this can never be juſtified; and it is no wonder that the empreſs was now bent upon his ejection, and that the emperor, who was wholly governed by her, was drawn into her meaſures.

Accordingly, on the Chriſtmas day following, the emperor declined going to church as uſual, and ſent to inform the biſhop, that he ſhould not communicate with him till he had given ſatisfaction with reſpect to the charges advanced againſt him; and he replying that he was ready to anſwer any thing that could be laid to his charge, a ſynod of the neighbouring biſhops was aſſembled, and in this he was condemned for having reſumed the epiſcopal functions without proper authority. When he pleaded that the proceedings of the council of Chalcedon had been reverſed by another which was ſubſequent to it, it was replied that the latter was not ſo numerous as the former, and therefore could not, according to the canons, reverſe its decrees. This law had been made by the Arians when they depoſed Athanaſius, and were apprehenſive of a change in the future temper of the times; and of this the catholics,

lics, who had no better precedent to ſerve their purpoſe, thought proper to avail themſelf *. Who does not ſee the deciſive influence of the will of the governing powers in theſe three councils?

After this ſentence Chryſoſtom deſiſted from diſcharging any of the epiſcopal functions, and confined himſelf to the epiſcopal houſe. But his adherents, whenever they had opportunity, to ſhew their attachment to him, formed ſeparate congregations, and were call *Joannites*. As it was evident that the people would never be quiet till the biſhop was removed, the emperor baniſhed him to Cuſcuſum in Armenia; but though much contrivance was uſed in conveying him out of the city, a tumult could not be prevented, and in it the church and ſenate houſe mentioned above were burned down †.

The friends of Chryſoſtom ſtill refuſing to communicate with his enemies, though Arſacius, a very worthy man was appointed to ſucceed him, the emperor ſent ſoldiers to diſperſe them wherever they were aſſembled; and, as is almoſt unavoidable when ſoldiers

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. viii. Cap. 20. p. 351. Socratis Hiſt. Lib. vi. Cap. 18. p. 335.

† Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. viii. Cap. 21, 22. p. 352.

are employed, many perſons were plundered of what they had of moſt value, and many quitted the city, eſpecially one Nicarete, a native of Nicomedia, of whom Sozomen gives the higheſt character.

When all was quiet within the city, the præfect began to make inquiry who were the authors of the fire; and being an heathen he ſeemed to rejoice in the calamity, and inflicted heavy puniſhments on many perſons*. On this occaſion many of the friends of Chryſoſtom forming ſeparate congregations, a law was made to prevent any of the catholics making any ſuch ſchiſms for the future on the penalty of excommunication†.

Innocent biſhop of Rome being informed of theſe proceedings againſt Chryſoſtom by Caſſian, and others of his friends who had been ſent from the Eaſt for the purpoſe, was much diſpleaſed at them, and wrote a letter of conſolation to him, and another to the people of his ſee, cenſuring their conduct; and obſerving that an Arian ſynod, by the rules of which they had been guided, ought

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. viii. Cap. 23. p. 354. Socratis Hiſt. Lib. vi. Cap. 18. p. 335.

† Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. viii. Cap. 24. p. 356.

not

not to have ſerved as a precedent for the catholics; and that it was neceſſary to call a more general council to reſtore the peace of the church. But the pains which he took for this purpoſe were defeated by the enemies of Chryſoſtom at Conſtantinople *.

The death of the empreſs, ſome peculiar circumſtances in that of Cyrinus the biſhop of Chalcedon, Chryſoſtom's inveterate enemy, and alſo a great hail which fell at Conſtantinople preſently after his baniſhment, were interpreted by his friends as marks of of the divine diſpleaſure at the conduct of his enemies †. In the mean time, he, having much wealth at his command, from the liberality of his friends, and eſpecially of Olympias the deaconeſs, employed it in acts of generoſity, eſpecially in redeeming from the Iſaurians many perſons whom they had carried away as ſlaves, in their incurſions to plunder the country; and in conſequence of this conduct, he lived in great reputation among the Armenians; and many perſons flocked to him from Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia ‡. This being a great mortification to

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. viii. Cap. 26. p. 359.
† Socratis Hiſt. Lib. vi. Cap. 19. p. 338.
‡ Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. viii. Cap. 27. p. 362.

his enemies, they procured an order for his removal to Pityuns; but he died on the journey at Comanis in Armenia, owing, it is ſaid, to the hardſhips to which he was expoſed*.

In the reign of Theodoſius II. ample juſtice was done to the memory of Chryſoſtom, his relics being then carried with great pomp, and an amazing concourſe of people, to Conſtantinople, on which occaſion the Propontis was covered with veſſels; and theſe being all furniſhed with torches, they made a moſt magnificent ſpectacle. When the relics were depoſited in the church, the emperor himſelf looking towards the coffin, ſolemnly aſked pardon in the name of his anceſtors for the injuries which they had done him†.

Arcadius himſelf did not long ſurvive Chryſoſtom, but died A. D. 408, univerſally beloved for his piety and gentle diſpoſition, without any reflection but that of having been governed too much by his favourites and his wife. He left a ſon of the name of Theodoſius juſt weaned, and three daughters, of whom the eldeſt, Pulcheria, was remark-

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. viii. Cap. 28. p. 363.
† Theod. Hiſt. Lib. v. Cap. 36. p. 236.

able

able for her virtue and piety, and the care which she took of the education of her brother, in whose name Anthemius, the præfect of the prætorian guards, administered the affairs of the government.

SECTION III.

Of the Disturbances in Egypt.

SINCE the empire became christian the Jews had not suffered much, the catholic emperors having had no other objects of their hostilities besides the heathens and the heretics. But they sometimes brought themselves into difficulties, and suffered in consequence of their turbulent disposition, and their inveteracy towards the christians. In this reign they were expelled from Alexandria for their cruel and licentious proceedings on the following occasion.

The people of this city were always disposed to factions, and the Jews, who resided there in great numbers ever since the time of Alexander the Great, were as ready as any

other of the inhabitants to enter into them; and, at this time, the people were much divided about a ſet of players, who exhibited on a Saturday, when the Jews, having nothing elſe to do, attended. They ſeeing one Hierax, a ſchoolmaſter, and a great admirer of Cyril, (the biſhop who had ſucceeded Theophilus) being always ready to begin to clap when ever he preached, enter the theatre, cried out that he came thither for no other purpoſe than to raiſe a diſturbance; and the Jews being favoured by Oreſtes the civil governor, who was jealous of the power of the biſhop on account of his frequently controuling him in his meaſures, Hierax was ſeized, and on ſome pretence, which is not mentioned, he was expoſed to torture on the public theatre.

This proceeding greatly exaſperated Cyril, who ſent for the chief of the Jews, and threatened them with his vengeance if they did not deſiſt from their ill offices to the chriſtians. But they, thinking they had the favour of the governor, were not diſpoſed to conciliation. On the contrary, a number of the lower ſort of them, having agreed upon a ſignal by which to diſtinguiſh one another, drew together a great concourſe of people in the

the night, by a cry which they raiſed, that the principal church in the city was on fire, and in the confuſion which this occaſioned they killed many chriſtians.

The authors of theſe murders being known, Cyril, without conſulting the governor, went the next day with a great multitude, and both ſeized upon the ſynagogue, and expelled all the Jews from the city. The præfect, diſpleaſed at this irregular and violent proceeding, and concerned to ſee ſuch a number of people leave the city, complained to the emperor, to whom Cyril alſo wrote, to explain the reaſons of his conduct. The biſhop and the præfect being now declared and irreconcilable enemies, the monks of Nitria, taking the part of the biſhop, came to the number of four or five hundred, and attacking the præfect, wounded him dangerouſly on the head with a ſtone, and diſperſed his attendants. But the people of the city, coming to his aſſiſtance, drove away the monks, and ſeizing on one of them, viz. Ammonius, who has been mentioned before, they expoſed him to ſo great torture that he died under it. This man Cyril buried in a church with great parade, as if he had been a martyr, though the hiſtorian ſays that ſenſible and moderate perſons

ſaw

ſaw his death in a very different light, as he did not ſuffer for his profeſſion of chriſtianity, but in conſequence of engaging in civil faction.

The party of Cyril incurred ſtill more blame by the ſhocking violence of which they were guilty with reſpect to the celebrated Hypatia, who, though a woman, taught philoſophy in the public Platonic ſchool at Alexandria. Becauſe ſhe was often obſerved to be in converſation with Oreſtes during this diſturbance, it was imagined that ſhe was in the party againſt the biſhop; and in conſequence of this a number of his friends, with Peter, a reader in the church, at their head, ſeized upon her as ſhe was going home in a chair, and dragging her into a church, they firſt ſtripped her naked, and then killed her with tiles; and having torn her limb from limb, they burned the parts in a public place in the city. This horrid outrage, unworthy even of brutes, juſtly brought a great degree of odium on Cyril, and the chriſtians in general. This happened in Lent, in the ſixth year of Theodoſius, A. D. 414.

In this laſt act of violence the Jews are not mentioned as having taken any part. If they had, it would have been that of Hypatia, but

at

at that time they were probably out of the city. But ſeveral of them ſuffered by the order of the emperor on another occaſion. At a place called Immeſtar, between Antioch and Chalcis, the Jews were entertaining themſelves with deriding the chriſtians, and Chriſt alſo. To do this more effectually, they tied a chriſtian boy to a croſs, at firſt only in ridicule, but at length they began to beat him, and whether they intended it or not, he died of the ill uſage. The emperor being informed of the tranſaction, ordered the governor of the province to make inquiry into the fact, and in conſequence of it all the perſons concerned ſuffered capital puniſhment*.

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. vii. Cap. 13, 14, 15, 16. p. 357, &c.

SEC-

SECTION IV.

An Outline of the political Events of the Reign of Honorius.

AS we are drawing near to the fall of the Weſtern empire, which makes a diſtinguiſhed æra in eccleſiaſtical hiſtory, it may not be diſpleaſing to the reader if I give a ſketch of the political events of it.

Both the ſons of Theodoſius being left very young, viz. Arcadius about eighteen years of age, and Honorius not more than eleven, they were committed to the care of able guardians, the elder to that of Rufinus, and the younger to that of Stilicho, who was originally a Vandal, but who had riſen by his merit to the command of the army, and had married a niece of Theodoſius.

Stilicho was ſucceſsful in his wars againſt the Goths, who had ravaged Greece; but by the intrigues of Eutropius, who, on the death of Rufinus, governed in the Eaſt; he was there declared a public enemy, the go-

vernors of the two parts of the empire being then jealous of each other. At the perſuaſion of Eutropius, Gildo, who commanded for Honorius in Africa, revolted againſt him, but he was reduced by Stilicho.

A.D. 387, Alaric the Goth, invaded Italy, but being defeated by Stilicho at the battle of Pollenza, he quitted it. After this battle Honorius aboliſhed the ſhews of gladiators, which, though forbidden by Conſtantine, had been tolerated by his ſucceſſors.

A. D. 405, Italy was again invaded by Alaric and Rhadagaiſus the pagan, with an army of not leſs than two (ſome ſay four) hundred thouſand men, but they were completely defeated by Stilicho, with little loſs. Rhadagaiſus was taken and put to death, and his immenſe army was totally deſtroyed and diſperſed.

A. D. 407, the Roman army in Britain choſe Conſtantine for their chief, and he ſoon made himſelf maſter of Gaul and Spain; and Honorius, unable to oppoſe him, acknowledged him as a partner in the empire. About the ſame time Stilicho having inſtigated Alaric to invade Italy, his treachery was diſcovered, and he was put to death, being ſucceeded by Olympius.

The

The next year Alaric advanced and laid ſiege to Rome, but on the promiſe of a ſum of money he retired. The ſum not being paid, and being joined by Athaulphus, who had married his ſiſter, he went to Rome again, and being received by the inhabitants, he made Attalus emperor. Honorius, however, being aſſiſted by Theodoſius the younger, who had ſucceeded his father Arcadius, A. D. 408, continued in Ravenna, and Alaric being offended with Attalus, depoſed him. But the inhabitants of Rome refuſing to admit him into the city, he took and plundered it, A. D. 410. After this Alaric retired into Campania, and ſoon after died, leaving Athaulfus his ſucceſſor. About the ſame time Conſtantine invaded Italy, but being defeated in Gaul, he and his ſon were put to death.

A. D. 412, the Gauls left Italy, and the year following Heraclianus revolted in Africa; but flying at the approach of the troops ſent to reduce him, he was put to death at Carthage. From this time Honorius enjoyed the empire in quiet till his death, A. D. 424, after a reign of twenty eight years from the death of his father.

Honorius, like his brother Arcadius, was a well meaning and pious, but a weak prince, utterly

utterly unequal to the conduct of the empire, in the precarious ſituation in which it then was; and Italy and all the countries ſubject to him, were grievouſly exhauſted by the wars in which he was engaged, and eſpecially by the neglect of agriculture, and the famines which were occaſioned by thoſe wars. He was ſucceeded by his ſon Valentinian III. at that time only five years old.

SECTION V.

Events relating to Heatheniſm.

THE heathens, ſeeing the deſolation of the empire by the invaſion of the northern nations, ſaid that it was owing to the diſuſe of their rites, and the prevalence of another religion than that under which it had riſen and flouriſhed; and this gave occaſion to that excellent treatiſe of Auſtin, *Of the City of God*, in which he ſhewed the vanity of the heathen religion, and how ill founded this opinion was. But there was at this time a much more effectual confutation of it in the event of the war with Rhadagaiſus.

He had revolted from Honorius, ravaged Pannonia, and entering Italy, A. D. 405, with the prodigious army mentioned above, threatened to plunder Rome. As he was an heathen, and very ſuperſtitious, never failing to ſacrifice to his gods every morning, the heathens, who were ſtill in great numbers in the city, gave out that he would certainly ſucceed, and ſaid that nothing could ſave them but aboliſhing chriſtianity, and reſtoring the religion of their anceſtors. Indeed the chriſtians were greatly terrified at this invaſion. But the total defeat of Rhadagaiſus by Stilicho, one half of his army periſhing by famine, and the other falling by the ſword, together with the death of this barbarian and his ſon, was an effectual confutation of that opinion of the heathens, concerning the ſupport which the empire received from the ancient religion.

The heathens, uneaſy, as Auſtin ſays, at the long duration of the chriſtian religion, gave out that an oracle had declared that the ancient religion would be reſtored, and chriſtianity aboliſhed every where three hundred and ſixty five years after its promulgation, which he ſays ought to have expired A. D. 398*.

* De civitatate Dei, Lib. xviii. Cap. ult. Opera, Vol. v. p. 1131.

But,

But, on the contrary, that year was peculiarly unfavourable to heatheniſm, in conſequence of the orders of the chriſtian emperors to demoliſh the temples, and deſtroy the idols. It was in this year that Gaudentius and Jovius, by the order of Honorius, deſtroyed the temples and images in Carthage, ſparing only thoſe which either ſerved for the ornament of the city, or were capable of being converted into chriſtian churches.

One of theſe temples dedicated to the goddeſs Cœleſtis, or Aſtarte, "was exceedingly "magnificient, and of prodigious magnitude, "and was encompaſſed by the temples of all "the gods. The place," ſays ſome African writer, quoted by Dr. Lardner, "was ſurround-"ed with beautiful walls, the ſtreets well pav-"ed with ſtones, and adorned with pillars; the "whole not much leſs than two miles in com-"paſs. Having been ſhut up ſome time be-"fore, and after that neglected, it was grown "over with thorns and thiſtles. When the "chriſtians propoſed to apply it to the uſe of "their own religion, the heathens exclaimed "againſt it, and ſaid that there were dragons "and aſps which guarded the temple, ſo that "it would be dangerous to come near it. But "the chriſtians, inſtead of being terrified, "were the more animated with a deſire to

" clear the ground, and to conſecrate the place " to the truly heavenly king their Lord*," alluding to the former dedication of this temple to Cœleſtis, or the queen of heaven.

In general the heathens made no oppoſition to the demolition of their temples, but when, about the time of this tranſaction, a temple of Hercules was attacked by the chriſtians at Sufferta, a Roman colony in Africa, the heathens reſiſted, and killed at leaſt ſixty chriſtians. However the image of Hercules was deſtroyed.

Another diſturbance on this occaſion happened at Calama A. D. 408 or 409, ſoon after the law enacted by Honorius in which the ſolemnities of the heathens were expreſſly forbidden; the account of which is thus given by Auſtin: " On the firſt day of June, in " contempt of laws lately enacted, the hea- " thens celebrated one of their ſacrilegious " ſolemnities, without prohibition from any, " paſſing through the ſtreets, and dancing " before the church in an inſolent manner, " not practiced even in the times of Julian; " and when ſome eccleſiaſtics attempted to " interrupt them, they threw ſtones againſt " the church. About eight days after, when " the biſhop put the chief men of the city in

* Lardner's Teſtimonies, Vol. iv. p. 421.

" mind

"mind of the laws, of which they were not "ignorant, and when they were going to "take ſome care of the affair as the laws "directed, thoſe inſolent people again threw "ſtones at the church.

"The next day the eccleſiaſtics went to "the magiſtrates, deſiring to enter a proceſs "againſt them, but were refuſed. On the "ſame day they began to throw ſtones a "third time, and alſo to ſet fire to the houſes "of ſome of the eccleſiaſtics, and actually "killed one perſon, the reſt concealing them-"ſelves, or making their eſcape as well as "they could. The biſhop hid himſelf in a "private place, where he heard thoſe who "were ſeeking for him with a deſign to kill "him, ſay that they had done nothing till "they found *him*."

"Nectarius, a heathen, and a man of diſ-"tinction in the place, hearing of this diſ-"turbance, and apprehenſive of the conſe-"quences, wrote a reſpectful letter to Auſtin, "earneſtly intreating for mercy. To this he "replied, that he and the other biſhops were "diſpoſed to ſhew all the gentleneſs that be-"came chriſtians; but that it was neceſſary "to inflict ſuch puniſhment as might be "ſufficient to deter others from following ſo

"bad an example*." Whether any puniſhment was inflicted is not ſaid, but the greateſt friend of univerſal toleration muſt acknowledge that ſuch flagrant breaches of the peace as this was, on whatever pretence committed, ought to be reſtrained by proper puniſhments.

SECTION VI.

Of the Arians in this Period.

IT happened in the time of Chryſoſtom that the Arians not being allowed to hold any aſſemblies within the city, but only without the gates, gained much popularity by their ſinging, in which they exerciſed themſelves every Saturday and Sunday, on which there were aſſemblies for public worſhip. This they did principally at the gate of the city in a manner which appears to have been particularly pleaſing, one part of the company ſinging one verſe and another the next, and ſo alternately through the whole piece.

* Lardner's Teſtimonies, Vol. iv. p. 425.

This

This they would often do a great part of the night; and very early in the morning, they would march in proceſſion through the middle of the city, ſinging all the way till they came to the place of their aſſembly without the gates; and in theſe hymns the Trinitarians were often reflected upon, as they would frequently ſay, but in Greek verſe, "*where* are "they who make three powers into one, &c."

Chryſoſtom being alarmed at this, and fearing leſt the more ſimple of the catholics ſhould be impreſſed with it, engaged a party of his own people to do the ſame; and as the hymns of theſe catholics were ſung with more parade than thoſe of the Arians, being attended with ſilver croſſes and wax lights, the expence of which was defrayed by the empreſs, the Arians, who exceeded the other ſingers in number, were provoked at this oppoſition; and the two parties, after much contention no doubt, having at length recourſe to arms (in which it is moſt probable that they who had the countenance of the ruling powers would be the aggreſſors) ſome were killed on both ſides, and Briſo, the empreſs's eunuch, who inſtructed the orthodox ſingers, was wounded in the forehead with a ſtone. On this account the emperor forbade the ſinging of the

Arians*. To have been impartial, the ſinging of both the parties ſhould have been prohibited.

The Arians were in great numbers at Synnada in Phrygia in this reign, and the perſecution of them by Theodoſius, the catholic biſhop of the place, had a very ſingular effect. For Agapetus their biſhop perſuaded his followers to become Conſubſtantialiſts, and being more beloved than Theodoſius, he was immediately choſen biſhop by both the parties. Atticus, the biſhop of Conſtantinople at this time, conſidering the event as favourable to the catholic cauſe, confirmed him in the ſee, and perſuaded Theodoſius to bear his excluſion with patience†. It is to be obſerved that theſe Arians were Macedonians, who differed little more than in words from the Conſubſtantialiſts, and who, as we have ſeen, had made no difficulty of uniting with them on a former occaſion.

In this reign Dorotheus, the biſhop of the Arians at Conſtantinople, died at the advanced age of one hundred and nineteen years, and was ſucceeded by Barba, in whoſe time the Arians appeared to advantage, in conſe-

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. vi. Cap. 8. p. 321.
† Ibid. Lib. vii. Cap. 3. p. 348.

quence

quence of having two men of great eminence among them, Timotheus and George, of whom the latter was the beſt ſkilled in Greek literature, and the former in the knowledge of the ſcriptures, which he was able to read in Hebrew. The hiſtorian Socrates was acquainted with Timotheus, and admired the readineſs with which he explained the difficult paſſages in ſcripture; but he wondered that theſe two men ſhould continue Arians, when one of them was a great admirer of Plato, and the other of Origen, both whoſe principles he thought unfavourable to their doctrine. He ſays, however, that they greatly improved upon the ſyſtem of Arius, leaving out many of its impieties and blaſphemies. But as this writer does not explain himſelf, it does not appear in what particulars they varied from Arius, or his followers*.

The Arians in Italy hoped that Attalus would favour them, becauſe he had been baptized by Sigeſarius the biſhop of the Goths, and was a man eſteemed by Alaric, who, like the reſt of his nation, was an Arian. But this nominal empire of Attalus was of ſhort duration. For

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. vii. Cap. 6. p. 351.

Alaric, who had made him emperor, ſoon depoſed him again*.

SECTION VII.

Of the Novatians.

THE Novatians continued to be very numerous in this period, and the catholics, notwithſtanding their agreement with them in ſo eſſential an article as that of the doctrine of the Trinity, did every thing in their power to ſuppreſs them. Chryſoſtom could not forbear threatening Siſinnius the Novatian biſhop of Conſtantinople, that he would ſilence him as an heretic, ſaying there ought to be only one biſhop in one city†. Cyril, who ſucceeded Theophilus, biſhop of Alexandria, was ſtill more violent. He ſhut up all the churches of the Novatians in that city, and took from them all their ſacred veſſels and ornaments. He even ſtripped Theopemptus their biſhop, as Socrates ſays, of all his own effects‡.

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. ix. Cap. 9. p. 375.
† Socratis Hiſt. Lib. vi. Cap. 22. p. 341.
‡ Ibid. Lib. vii. Cap. 7. p. 352.

Notwith-

Notwithſtanding theſe hardſhips, the affairs of the Novatians, in Conſtantinople at leaſt, proſpered greatly after the death of Siſinnius, as well as before. Indeed, there ſeems to have been a ſucceſſion of excellent men at the head of their churches in this metropolis, and men who were very deſervedly in great favour at court, and with the people in general, though the catholic biſhops took much umbrage at them. Siſinnius, whoſe wiſh was a law to his people, had on his death-bed recommended Chryſanthius to ſucceed him. He was the ſon of Marcian, who had been biſhop of the Novatians before Siſinnius, had acquired great reputation by his military ſervices, had been conſul, and the emperor's vicar in Britain, and on his return to Conſtantinople was candidate for the office of præfect of the city. His caſe was remarkably ſimilar to that of Ambroſe at Milan. For, like him, who had alſo held high offices in civil life, Chryſanthius was with much difficulty prevailed upon to accept the biſhoprick, and he diſtinguiſhed himſelf as much by his faithful diſcharge of the duties of it afterwards; ſo that he added much to the credit of the Novatians in Conſtantinople. Out of his own fortune he contributed

to the ſupport of the poor; and he never received from the church more than two loaves, which were offered for the communion ſervice every Lord's day. Out of his zeal to promote the intereſt of his ſect, he engaged Ablabius a rhetorician, whoſe elegant orations were much admired, to be his preſbyter, and who was afterwards biſhop of the Novatians at Nice *.

The Novatians ſuffered at Rome as much as they did at Alexandria through the jealouſy and arrogance of the catholic biſhops, Anaſtaſius firſt, and afterwards Celeſtinus, doing the ſame that Cyril did. For they deprived the Novatians of their churches in that city, and obliged them to hold their aſſemblies in private houſes. Till that time the Novatians had flouriſhed much at Rome, having poſſeſſion of many churches, with large congregations. But at Conſtantinople the catholics acted a more generous part, and behaved towards them as brethren †.

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. vii. Cap. 12. p. 356.
† Ibid. Lib. vii. Cap. 9. p. 354. Cap. 11. p. 356.

SEC-

SECTION VIII.

Of the Donatiſts.

IN Africa the Donatiſts continued to give as much trouble in this as in any former period. In A. D. 411, there was a ſolemn conference between them and the catholics at Carthage, ſeven biſhops being choſen on each ſide to manage the debate. On the part of the catholics the principal was Auſtin, and on that of the Donatiſts was Petilian biſhop of Cirtha; and eight biſhops were appointed to write. The acts of this conference are preſerved, but they are not intereſting at preſent, eſpecially as it had no good effect, and things remained in the ſame ſtate after the conference as before it. The Donatiſts did not deſire the conference, but were compelled to it by the order of the emperors; and when they did meet refuſed to ſit in company with their adverſaries, conſidering them as profane perſons; and through the whole debate they reſolutely maintained that theirs was the only true church. However Marcelli-

Marcellinius the emperor's deputy, and who was the umpire in the debate (how fair an one may eaſily be imagined) declared in favour of the catholics; and by the ſentence of this court, the Donatiſts were deprived of their churches, and puniſhed in various other ways. His ſucceſſor, Dulcitius, purſued theſe unhappy people with the ſame violence, baniſhing them from the country; in conſequence of which many of them are ſaid to have deſtroyed themſelves.

Gildon, who revolted from Honorius in Africa, having taken the part of the Donatiſts, they are ſaid to have committed great ravages upon the catholics, and to have maſſacred many biſhops and preſbyters; in conſequence of which a law was made to puniſh thoſe outrages with death. Petilian abovementioned complained of this law as a perſecuting one, but Auſtin properly replied, that robbers and murderers ought always to be puniſhed. This Petilian was a learned and eloquent man, and wrote many books in defence of his ſect, and among others an inſtruction for their clergy, which was much admired. Auſtin was indefatigable in oppoſing the Donatiſts by conferences, preaching, and writing, and his ſucceſs was very conſiderable. By one means or other, however, they

were

were ſo far reduced in his time, that we hear very little of them afterwards*.

There ſeems to have been no reaſon why the Donatiſts might not have been tolerated as well as the Novatians, from whom they differed very little, eſpecially as they were orthodox with reſpect to the doctrine of the trinity. It was perſecution that made them deſperate, ſo that the long continuance of this ſchiſm, and all the miſchiefs which aroſe from it, muſt be aſcribed to the catholics.

Several councils were held in Africa in this period, eſpecially one in A. D. 398, when two hundred and fifteen biſhops met at Carthage, and made one hundred and four canons; but as, like the decrees of moſt other provincial ſynods, they relate chiefly to matters of interior diſciple, I do not think it neceſſary to trouble my readers with the particulars.

* Sueur, A. D. 398.

SEC-

SECTION IX.

Of the Pelagian Controverſy.

IT was in the reign of Honorius that the Pelagian controverſy took its riſe, a controverſy which produced ſuch laſting conſequences in the Weſtern part of the world, though they were but little known in the Eaſt. To this we owe the doctrines of *original ſin*, *predeſtination*, and that of the neceſſity of *ſupernatural grace* to every good thought, word, or action, and ultimately that of *atonement*; doctrines of which we find no trace in any former period, but which notwithſtanding took the deepeſt root in the chriſtianity of the Latin church, and which were ſo far from being removed by the reformation under Luther, that they were much ſtrengthened by that means, and carried farther than before, in order to oppoſe the popiſh doctrine of *merit*, as the foundation of the doctrines of *ſupererogation* and *indulgencies*.

Pelagius was a Britiſh monk (his original name probably *Morgan*, which he tranſlated into

into Greek) a man of excellent underſtanding, learning, and good morals, who came to Rome in company with Celeſtius, an Iriſh monk, a little after A. D. 400. Offended at the ſuperſtition of the times, and eſpecially at the notion of the mere act of *baptizing* waſhing away ſin, he ſet himſelf to oppoſe it; maintaining that it was *good works*, and not *water*, that waſhed away ſin. As one principal argument in favour of his doctrine, he alleged that the deſign of baptiſm could not be to waſh away ſin, ſince it was applied to infants, who had not ſinned. This doctrine, ſo agreeable to good ſenſe, and the plain tenor of the ſcriptures, gave no offence at Rome, where it was firſt preached.

From Rome theſe two monks went to Africa, and thence Pelagius proceeded to Paleſtine, where he was well received by John the biſhop of Jeruſalem. But his friend Celeſtius, preaching the ſame doctrine in Africa, excited the attention, and at length the utmoſt indignation, of Auſtin, the great oracle of that country, and indeed of his age, and of future ages.

This great man was ſhocked, as he ſays, to hear it advanced that baptiſm was not applied for the remiſſion of ſins, which is ſo

contrary to the very words of ſcripture. From this it is evident that the notion of the baptiſmal water itſelf really waſhing away ſin, which we have ſeen to have prevailed in the time of Conſtantine, had taken firm hold on the minds of chriſtians in general, ſince ſuch a man as Auſtin did not eſcape its influence. It does not appear, however, that Auſtin, or any other perſon, had given due attention to the neceſſary conſequences of this ſuperſtitious and abſurd opinion before this time; and they might have remained unknown for ages, if it had not been for the controverſy that followed on this ſubject between Auſtin and Pelagius. For Auſtin himſelf, as well as all other chriſtian writers on the ſubject of morals, and eſpecially thoſe who wrote againſt the Manichæans (who held that ſome ſouls were neceſſarily wicked) had advanced doctrines utterly inconſiſtent with what he maintained afterwards; ſaying that every man has a power to do the will of God, and to render himſelf acceptable to him.

But now, having to maintain the literal meaning of *baptiſm waſhing away ſin*, and children having no ſin of their own to be waſhed away by it, he ſaid that they had *original ſin* (a name and thing intirely unknown before)

before) as they derived ſome defilement from Adam, from whom they were deſcended. Still however, he did did not ſay, with his followers in a much later period, that Adam was the conſtituted repreſentative of his whole race, ſo that the guilt of his particular tranſgreſſion was transferred to them, and that they were properly anſwerable for it. For the abſurd ideas of *imputed guilt* and *imputed righteouſneſs* were as yet unknown. But he thought that a natural *proneneſs to ſin*, which might be called *defilement*, was derived from Adam to all his poſterity.

In conſequence of this he was obliged to maintain that, till this ſinfulneſs was done away, men had no power to do the will of God, and that this power could only be the gift of God, or his ſpecial *grace*, imparted at baptiſm. It was not therefore through life by any proper power of men's own, but only by the aid of this ſuperadded and ſupernatural grace, that any man could do what was pleaſing to God.

It does not appear to have ſhocked this great and good man that, upon his ſcheme, all the heathens muſt have been left in a ſtate of damnation. But he owned that their good works (which however he ſometimes called *ſhining*

ſins) were not only intitled to reward in this life, but would leſſen their future torment. The caſe of children dying unbaptized in infancy was ſtill more puzzling upon this new ſyſtem. For though it has not at all ſhocked ſome of Auſtin's followers, to think that a new born child ſhould be deſtined to ſuffer the extreme pains of hell fire to all eternity, no perſon of the age in which Auſtin lived was at all prepared to receive it. However, as it was evident that their original ſin had not been waſhed away, he could not, with any conſiſtency with his new doctrine, maintain that they would be in the condition of thoſe who had no ſin. He therefore ſaid that their ſufferings would be ſo light, that their condition would be preferable to non-exiſtence.

Before this controverſy Auſtin had maintained, ſenſibly enough, that in the future ſtate infants would not be the proper ſubjects either of reward or of puniſhment, and therefore that when they entered upon it, it would neither be in a ſtate of happineſs nor miſery; thinking, probably, that, as they had not gone through a ſtate of trial or diſcipline here, they would hereafter.

As Auſtin could not deny that many perſons who had been baptized became afterwards very

very wicked, and therefore could not be ſuppoſed to go to heaven; not to give up his doctrine of *baptiſm waſhing away ſin*, he diſtinguiſhed between *regeneration*, of which all who were baptized partook, and the capacity of *final ſalvation*, to which *perſeverance* in virtue would alone intitle them. But ſince, in order to ſupport his doctrine of original ſin, he had maintained that by the fall of Adam all men had loſt the power of doing the will of God, and of rendering themſelves acceptable to him, and conſequently that every good thought, word, and work muſt be aſcribed to ſupernatural grace (which of courſe was the gift of God, and which, antecedently to good works, no man was intitled to more than another) this great man was reduced to the farther neceſſity of maintaining that *perſevering grace*, and conſequently that *ſalvation* which was the conſequence of it, was the ſovereign and arbitrary gift of God, to thoſe whom before the foundation of the world he thought proper to predeſtinate to eternal life, while all the reſt of mankind were, without any fault of theirs, left in a ſtate of *reprobation*, and of courſe doomed to everlaſting puniſhment.

Shocking as theſe opinions are, and novel as they were in the age of Auſtin, his ingenuity

was at no loſs for arguments to ſupport them, and eſpecially from the epiſtles of Paul; and his authority was ſo great, that after ſome time, and with ſome modifications, they were univerſally received in the Latin church.

To this very day this ſyſtem, ſo fatal to virtue, if it were properly purſued, does not fail to recommend itſelf to many humble and pious perſons, by its ſeeming to take from the *pride of man*, and to give all glory to God. This hiſtory, however, furniſhes a remarkable inſtance of the many important conſequences which ſometimes follow from ſingle and unguarded poſitions, and conſequently ought to be a ſtanding warning to us to give the moſt rigorous attention to *firſt principles*, as to *ſeeds*, from which great and unknown things may ariſe. Who would have imagined that from the ſuperſtitious notion of *baptiſm waſhing away ſin*, chriſtianity would ever have been loaded, and diſgraced, with ſuch doctrines as *original ſin*, abſolute *predeſtination*, with its conſequence *reprobation*, and alſo with the doctrine of *atonement* in its higheſt ſenſe, (or that of the ſufferings of an infinite being are neceſſary to expiate the ſins of men) and of men's being ſaved, not by any works of their

their own, but by the righteouſneſs of Chriſt imputed to them?

I ſhall not give the particulars of this memorable controverſy, obſerving only that Auſtin procured the opinions of his adverſary to be condemned in a council held at Carthage, A. D. 412. But notwithſtanding this, the Pelagian doctrine was, for ſome time, received with great applauſe at Rome, Zozimus the biſhop of Rome, being a favourer of it; nor was Auſtin's doctrine of predeſtination in particular confirmed by any council within a century after his death. For though it was defended by the moſt celebrated divines in the Weſt, particularly by Proſper and Hilary, biſhops in Gaul, it was never generally received in the Eaſt.

It alſo met with particular oppoſition in the ſouthern parts of France, which was owing in a great meaſure to the popularity of Caſſian, a native of Scythia, and a diſciple of Chryſoſtom, who after the fall of his maſter, came to Rome, and afterwards ſettled in Gaul, and founded two monaſteries in the neighbourhood of Marſeilles. Caſſian, however, was no advocate for the doctrine of Pelagius in its full extent, but maintained a doctrine which ſoon got the name of *Semi-pelagianiſm*.

Pelagius himſelf had aſſerted that mankind derive no injury whatever from the fall of Adam, and he denied the neceſſity of *internal grace*. But Auſtin's doctrine of ſome moral depravity affecting all mankind in conſequence of the ſin of Adam, and that of the neceſſity of ſupernatural grace to human virtue, was generally acceptable. Theſe, therefore, were admitted by the Semipelagians. But to avoid the doctrine of *predeſtination*, which we have ſeen to be the natural conſequence of the other, they held that, notwithſtanding the neceſſity of divine grace, the imparting of it depended upon ourſelves. They therefore ſaid that it was not neceſſary to the firſt beginning of repentance, but only to our progreſs in virtue; and that all the predeſtination to eternal life which is mentioned in the ſcriptures, is upon the foreſight of thoſe good works which make men the proper ſubjects of future happineſs

I muſt obſerve, however, that the doctrines of Auſtin (though it is no wonder that many perſons ſhould be ſtaggered at them, and receive them with difficulty) neceſſarily follow from thoſe firſt principles which the Semipelagians admitted. For if divine grace be neceſſary to any act of virtue, it certainly muſt be ſo to the *firſt*, which of courſe is the moſt difficult

difficult of any; and if the imparting of *that* depend upon the arbitrary will of God, all the virtues of a man's life, and conſequently his final happineſs, muſt be equally dependant upon it. There is therefore no proper medium between the doctrines of Auſtin and thoſe of Pelagius.

As there are only a few more particulars in the hiſtory of this controverſy, which fall within the compaſs of my work, I ſhall not make a ſeparate article of them, but juſt mention them here. Pelagius and his friend Celeſtius, being overborne by the authority of Auſtin, were in a manner obliged to leave the continent of Europe, and they retired to Britain, where their tenets had found a favourer in Agricola, the ſon of Severian. To counteract them Germanus biſhop of Auxerre, and Lupus of Troies were deputed by a ſynod in Gaul, to go over to Britain; and this miſſion had all the effect that could have been expected from it. However, upon their return Pelagianiſm prevailed ſo much again, that ſeven years afterwards, it was thought neceſſary that Germanus ſhould viſit Britain once more; and he was then accompanied by Severus the biſhop of Triers, the diſciple of Lupus, biſhop of Troies. And they exerted themſelves ſo ef-

fectually, that it is ſaid the Pelagians were baniſhed the iſland, by the conſent of all the inhabitants*.

Whatever was the fate of the proper Pelagians, the Semipelagians had reſpectable advocates in Vincentius biſhop of Lirins, and Gennadius, both of them writers of eminence. Their great opponent was Proſper.

SECTION X.

Of the Writers in the Time of Theodoſius and his Sons.

THIS period abounded with writers, and ſome of them were men of conſiderable eminence and reputation, and thoſe in the Weſt were ſuperior in general to the chriſtian writers in that part of the world, in the former period.

Of Ambroſe mention has been made in the courſe of the hiſtory, as a man of ſingular courage and probity. He was a native of Rome,

* Bede, Lib. i. Cap. 17. p. 18, &c. Sueur, A. D. 429.

but

but of Gallic origin. On his being appointed biſhop of Milan, he ſold all his eſtates for the uſe of the poor, and applied himſelf wholly to ſacred literature, in which he was a great proficient, and became a voluminous writer. In his tracts on this ſubject he appears to have been a ſtrenuous defender of the doctrine of the trinity, in favour of which he produced many new and ſingular arguments, or rather illuſtrations, which were adopted by his diſciple Auſtin, and which may be ſeen in my *Hiſtory of early Opinions concerning Chriſt.* Beſides his tracts relating to the doctrine of the trinity, which are three books concerning the Holy Spirit, five concerning faith, and a diſcourſe on the incarnation, we have of his ſix books on the ſacraments, and as many on the work of the ſix days, an expoſition of twelve pſalms, and a variety of miſcellaneous pieces.

Jerom was born at Stridon in Pannonia. When he was a boy he ſtudied grammar under Donatus at Rome, and rhetoric under Victorinus. Being determined to learn Hebrew, he was at a great expence in procuring Jewiſh teachers, and was the only chriſtian of his age who was maſter of that language. He travelled through Gaul with Bonoſus, a man of fortune,

fortune, and a companion of his ſtudies, examining all the libraries in their way; and at Aquileia, he contracted a friendſhip with Rufinus, a preſbyter of that place. Arriving at Antioch, he made choice of the monaſtic life; and reſiding four years in a ſolitude between Syria and Arabia (where he was ſupported at the expence of Evagrius, a rich citizen of Antioch, in whoſe company he had travelled from Aquileia through Dalmatia, Thrace, and ſeveral provinces of Aſia) he applied himſelf diligently to ſtudy, and there he began to write.

A. D. 378, he was made a preſbyter by Paulinus of Antioch, and going to Conſtantinople, a little before the general council there, he attached himſelf to Gregory of Nazianzum. In 382, Paulinus and Epiphanius took him with them to Rome, where he lived three years with Paula, a woman of high rank and great piety, and there he acted as ſecretary to Damaſus the biſhop. Thence he went to Cyprus, Antioch, Jeruſalem, and Egypt, where he became a hearer of Didymus, the celebrated defender of the doctrine of the trinity in that country; and at length he ſettled at Bethlehem, where he compoſed the greater part of his works. Here he had a violent

violent quarrel with Rufinus, and John biſhop of Jeruſalem, on account of the principles of Origen, which they defended. He alſo entered deeply into the Pelagian controverſy. But though he was ſtrictly orthodox with reſpect to the doctrine of the trinity, he wrote nothing of conſequence on that ſubject.

The greateſt part of the writings of Jerom are commentaries on the ſcriptures. But beſides theſe, we have of him a catalogue of the eccleſiaſtical writers, the lives of Paul the hermit, of Hilarion, and of Malchus, and a great number of letters, many of which are controverſial, and in favour of the monks, as thoſe againſt Jovinian and Vigilantius, which are written with very unbecoming aſperity. Jerom was the moſt learned of all the chriſtians of his age, being acquainted with Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, and he was a man of great ability, but of a violent temper, and too much attached to the monkiſh maxims. For ſo voluminous a writer, his works are of little real value.

Rufinus, firſt the friend, and then the adverſary of Jerom, was a native of Aquileia, where he was made preſbyter. Making choice of the monkiſh life, he went to Egypt, where

where he became converſant with the monks of Nitria, and with Didymus of Alexandria; but ſuffering much from the Arians, he removed to Paleſtine, where, being aided by the wealth of Melania, with whom he had travelled into the Eaſt, he founded a monaſtery, and there he ſpent about twenty five years, hoſpitably receiving thoſe, who, for the ſake of religion, made pilgrimages to Jeruſalem. Returning to Rome with Melania, A. D. 397, he tranſlated the works of Origen into Latin; but rendering himſelf obnoxious on this account, and being likewiſe accuſed of plagiariſm in that reſpect, he withdrew to Aquileia, where he wrote his books again Jerom. Being condemned as an heretic by Damaſus biſhop of Rome, and his native city being laid waſte by Alaric, he retired to Sicily, A. D. 410, and died there the year following.

Rufinus was one of the very few of the Latins who underſtood Greek, and almoſt the only one who took the pains to tranſlate the writings of the Greeks into Latin. By this means we have now ſeveral of the works of Origen, which are not extant in the language in which they were written. But he is not thought to have tranſlated exactly or faithfully.

fully. Indeed he profeſſed to alter what was moſt offenſive in the works of his author. Rufinus's own works conſiſt of commentaries on ſeveral parts of ſcripture, an expoſition of the apoſtles creed, and two books of eccleſiaſtical hiſtory; but they are not of much value.

Paulinus was a native of Rome, of a patrician and conſular family from Gaul. His preceptor, Auſonius, being appointed tutor to the children of Gratian, he came to Rome along with him, and there he pleaded cauſes, and A. D. 375, was advanced to the conſulſhip. The next year he travelled through moſt of the Weſtern provinces, where he contracted an intimacy with Ambroſe, Martin of Triers, and other conſiderable perſons. After ſpending fifteen years in this excurſion, he was made a preſbyter by Eulampius biſhop of Barcelona in Spain, the people almoſt forcing him to accept of that honour; and afterwards going to Nola in Campania, he was made biſhop of that city. He was a man of great piety and charity, ſo that when the Goths plundered Campania, he expended all his fortune in redeeming captives. He alſo laid out great ſums in ornamenting his church with pictures and ſtatues. His works

conſiſt

conſiſt of *epiſtles*, ſeveral of which are addreſſed to Sulpicius Severus, and of *poems*.

Auſtin, who was one of the greateſt men, as well as the moſt voluminous writer, of his age, was a native of Tagaſta in Numidia, where his family was of conſiderable rank, and his mother Monica was remarkable for her piety and virtue. He diſtinguiſhed himſelf ſo much by his application to literature, that when he was very young he taught grammar in his native city, and rhetoric at Carthage. For ſome time he frequented the bar, and then he became a Manichæan. But being tired of the wrangling of the lawyers, he, much againſt the will of his mother, went to Rome, where he had pupils, and thence he was ſent by Symmachus the præfect of the city to teach rhetoric at Milan, in conſequence of an order which he had received from the emperor to ſend ſome able perſon thither in that character.

At Milan Auſtin became intimately acquainted with Ambroſe, who contributed much to wean him from his attachment to Manichæiſm. But he himſelf acknowledges that he was reconciled to the doctrine of the trinity by reading the works of Plato, which had been tranſlated into Latin, and that otherwiſe

wiſe he ſhould have embraced the doctrine of Photinus, and have thought that Chriſt was a mere man.

Returning to Africa, and being at Hippo upon ſome buſineſs A. D. 391, he was with much difficulty prevailed upon to accept the office of preſbyter; and, contrary to the cuſtom which had prevailed in Africa, Valerius the biſhop of that city employed him in preaching; and in this capacity he diſtinguiſhed himſelf ſo much, that, contrary alſo to univerſal cuſtom, he was, at the requeſt of the biſhop, and with much reluctance on his own part, ordained biſhop along with him. This was an extraordinary meaſure which that church took from their fear of loſing a man whom they ſo highly valued.

In this diſtinguiſhed rank Auſtin was, in the language of the Apoſtle, *in labours moſt abundant*, and in all the duties of the epiſcopal office moſt exemplary. Beſides being principally concerned in all the councils of Africa, which were numerous in his time, he wrote more books than any other man of his age, moſt of them controverſial, againſt the Manichæans, Donatiſts, Pelagians, and all who were called heretics. To promote learning among his clergy, he formed them into a collegiate

collegiate body, and ſubjected them to a regular diſcipline, ſimilar to that of the monaſteries; and this excellent example was followed by other churches, which on this account were called *collegiate* ones. He died during the ſiege of Hippo by the Vandals A. D. 430, at the age of ſeventy ſix.

I do not propoſe to enumerate all the writings of Auſtin that are now extant, but ſhall content myſelf with mentioning the principal of them. Beſides his works of controverſy (among which is a large treatiſe on the doctrine of the trinity, in fifteen books, in which he maintains the perfect equality of the three perſons) he wrote a moſt excellent work againſt the heathens, intitled *De Civitate Dei*, which is one of the moſt learned and valuable productions of chriſtian antiquity. His other works are commentaries on ſeveral parts of ſcripture, *Meditations*, *Confeſſions*, conſiſting of a moſt candid and inſtructive account of the principal incidents of his life (in which it is much to be wiſhed that more perſons had followed his example) as alſo in his *Retractations*, a work written late in life, in which with the greateſt frankneſs he acknowledges, and corrects, the miſtakes he had made in his earlier productions. Be-

ſides theſe we have of his a great number of ſmall tracts, and many epiſtles.

Sulpicius Severus was a native of Aquitania in Gaul, and of a noble family. In his youth he ſtudied eloquence, and acquired conſiderable reputation at the bar, but after this he became a preſbyter of Primulia, and was intimate with Martin of Triers, Paulinus, and Jerome. At one time he was a Pelagian, but afterwards a catholic, though a favourer of the doctrine of the Millenarians. He wrote, in very elegant Latin, a conciſe eccleſiaſtical hiſtory, from the beginning of the world to A.D. 400; the life of Martin, above mentioned; three dialogues, one on the virtues of the monks, and two concerning thoſe of Martin; and likewiſe ſeveral epiſtles.

John Chryſoſtom, whoſe hiſtory has been given in the courſe of this work, was the moſt diſtinguiſhed of all the Greek Fathers, as Auſtin was among the Latins. The greateſt part of his writings are ſermons, or expoſitions of ſcripture, delivered as ſermons, with practical improvements annexed to them. The moſt regular of his treatiſes is a dialogue on the duties of a biſhop. But in this, as in all his works, it is evident that he ſtudied eloquence, in which, indeed, he greatly excel-

led. A ſerious man cannot help perceiving that a diſplay of his talents was too much an object with Chryſoſtom. On the contrary, Auſtin does not appear to have written any thing with that view. He never wrote except when he thought he had ſome thing of importance to communicate. We therefore ſee more of the man, and of the heart, in his writings.

Syneſius was a native of Cyrene in Lybia, who was ſent on an embaſſy to the emperor Arcadius, about A. D. 400, to preſent him with a crown of gold; when he delivered an oration on that ſubject. About A. D. 410 his fellow citizens preſſed him to be their biſhop, and though he frankly acknowledged that he could not part with his wife, and that he was not even ſatisfied with reſpect to the doctrine of the reſurrection, they allowed him his wife, and bore with his ſcruples. But after he was ordained they had no cauſe of complaint with reſpect to his faith. He is reckoned an elegant writer, but his works are not of much value. They are the oration above-mentioned, two books on providence, ten hymns, homilies on the ſeventy fourth pſalm, ſeveral ſmall tracts, and a hundred and fifty five epiſtles.

PERIOD

PERIOD XIII.

FROM THE DEATH OF HONORIUS, A. D. 424, TO THE FALL OF THE WESTERN EMPIRE, A. D. 475.

SECTION I.

Of the Neſtorian Controverſy, till the Council of Epheſus.

IT might ſeem that nothing more could have been done with reſpect to the doctrine of the trinity after the acknowledgment of the proper deity of Chriſt, and the perfect equality of all the three perſons. But in the reign of Theodoſius the ſecond, who ſucceeded Arcadius, there aroſe among the catholics another queſtion, the deciſion of which occaſioned as much diſturbance as any that had preceded it.

It was no longer doubted among them, that there was a trinity in the divine nature, or that one of the perſons in this trinity, viz. the ſecond, or the *logos*, was united to the man Jeſus; ſo that in Chriſt there were *two natures*, the divine and the human. But it had not been fully determined that theſe two natures made *one perſon*. There was therefore room for ſomething very like unitarianiſm under all the forms of orthodoxy. For by conſidering the two natures of Chriſt as diſtinct from each other, it might be ſaid that Chriſt was properly a man, and that the divine logos dwelled in him, and acted by him; juſt as the proper unitarians ſaid that Chriſt was a mere man, but that God the Father dwelled in him, and acted by him. And this was the doctrine which, from Neſtorius who advanced it, was called *Neſtorianiſm*, and which is profeſſed by a conſiderable part of the Eaſtern church to this day.

It may be queſtioned, however, whether Neſtorius ever held this opinion, or had any clear conception of it, at the time that he drew upon him the notice of his brethren. As, on the other hand, it may be queſtioned whether the catholics themſelves held any opinion on the ſubject that was really different from this, till,

till, in the courſe of controverſy, they came to conſider it as heretical. For when it is allowed that there are two natures in Chriſt, ſo different as thoſe of *God* and *man*, all the *terms* that could be contrived to expreſs the *manner of their union* muſt be equally deſtitute of ideas. Conſequently, when the catholics did afterwards determine that theſe two natures make but *one perſon*, they did not, in reality, add any new propoſition to their former creed, becauſe no new ideas can be affixed to the terms. We are now therefore to conſider what was in fact a mere controverſy about *words*; but which was the cauſe of as much animoſity, as if it had related to the moſt intelligible and the moſt important of *things*.

Neſtorius was a native of Germanicia, who had been made a preſbyter of the church of Antioch, where, like Chryſoſtom, he had acquired great reputation by his learning, his preaching, and his piety; and on the death of Siſinius, A. D. 427, he had ſucceeded to the ſee of Conſtantinople, whither he had brought Anaſtaſius one of his fellow preſbyters, and a particular friend of his at Antioch. This Anaſtaſius, in one of his ſermons, reproved ſome of the common people for calling

the Virgin Mary *the mother of God;* ſaying, that it was more proper to call her the *mother of Chriſt*, for that God could not be the offſpring of a human being. Complaint being brought of this to Neſtorius, he openly approved of what had been aſſerted by his preſbyter, and added, as it is ſaid, "that a child "of two or three months old could not be a "god;" meaning that what was born of Mary was mere man, though a divine nature was ſuperadded to him afterwards*.

Now in this there was nothing that was really contrary to any thing that had been declared to be orthodoxy by any council, or any eminent writer, ſuch as Athanaſius, Baſil, or Gregory of Nazianzum. Becauſe it had not been ſettled, or, as far as appears, ſo much as conſidered, at what *time* the divine nature was ſuperadded to the human nature in Chriſt, whether at the moment of his conception in the womb, at the time of his birth, or at any other particular period; and it is very probable that had the queſtion been propoſed at the council of Nice, it would have been thought of little conſequence, provided that when Chriſt began to act in a public charac-

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. vii. Cap. 28, 29, 32. p. 380. Evag. Lib. i. Cap. 2. p. 252.

ter,

ter, to preach, and to work miracles, he could be ſaid to be truly *God and man*. For every imaginable conſequence would be the ſame in all theſe caſes; and all the arguments by which the doctrine of the divinity of Chriſt had ever been ſupported have juſt the ſame weight on all the ſuppoſitions. But human paſſions, when they interfere, as they did in a very great degree in this buſineſs, can make any queſtion to be of importance; and here it happened that two men of over-bearing and violent tempers met. For ſuch were the characters both of Neſtorius, and Cyril of Alexandria, his rival, and chief opponent.

Neſtorius, immediately on his arrival at Conſtantinople, diſtinguiſhed himſelf by his zeal againſt hereſy; ſaying, in his firſt ſermon, delivered in the preſence of the court, "Give me, O emperor, the earth free from "heretics, and I in return will give you hea-"ven. Conquer the heretics for me, and I "will conquer the Perſians for you." Within five days after his ordination he drove the Arians to ſuch extremity of deſpair, by endeavouring to take from them a place in which they held their private aſſemblies, that they themſelves ſet fire to it, and many of the neighbouring houſes were conſumed along

with it. From this circumſtance not only the heretics, but thoſe of his own perſuaſion, gave him the name of the *incendiary*. He endeavoured to ſuppreſs the Novatians, out of envy, ſays Socrates, of Paul their biſhop, who was eminent for ſanctity of manners. But the emperor reſtrained his violence. He alſo greatly harraſſed the Quartodecimans in Aſia, Lydia, and Caria; and a ſedition being excited at Miletus and Sardis, in conſequence of this perſecution, many perſons loſt their lives in it*.

The Macedonians were ſo much harraſſed in conſequence of the orders of Neſtorius, by Antonius, biſhop of Germa, that, out of deſpair and revenge, they conſpired againſt his life and put him to death. And Neſtorius, having obtained this advantage againſt them, perſuaded the emperor to take all their churches from them, and among them that which they had at Conſtantinople, at Cyzicum, and many others in the villages about the Helleſpont. After this, ſays our hiſtorian, ſome of the Macedonians joined the catholics.

In conſequence of what Neſtorius had maintained concerning Mary not being the

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. vii. Cap. 29. p. 378.

mother

mother of God but only *of Chriſt*, he was by many charged with holding the opinion of Paul of Samoſata and Photinus. But Socrates ſays that, after reading his works, he was ſatisfied that he held no ſuch doctrine*. Whatever was the real opinion of Neſtorius at this time, Cyril of Alexandria, who was at enmity with him (απεχθως ειχε προς αυτον) as his predeceſſor Timotheus had been with Chryſoſtom, reproved him by his letters upon the ſubject; and Neſtorius replying to him, a controverſy aroſe, in which Celeſtinus, biſhop of Rome took part with Cyril; and in a ſynod held A. D. 430, condemned the doctrine of his adverſary. Cyril alſo called a ſynod of the biſhops of Egypt at Alexandria, in which was recited the letter which Celeſtinus wrote in conſequence of the ſynod at Rome, and alſo *twelve propoſitions*, and as many *anathemas*, drawn up by Cyril himſelf againſt the doctrine of Neſtorius. Theſe being approved by the ſynod, copies of them were tranſmitted to Neſtorius at Conſtantinople.

Notwithſtanding the reſolutions of theſe ſynods of Rome and Alexandria, Neſtorius made no change in his preaching; and in this ſtage of the buſineſs he had ſeveral reſpect-

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. vii. Cap. 32. p. 381.

able

able biſhops on his ſide. John biſhop of Antioch was intirely in his intereſt, thinking that Cyril renewed the hereſy of Apollinaris; and Theodoret biſhop of Cyrus, the hiſtorian, drew up twelve propoſitions in anſwer to thoſe of Cyril, the object of which was to ſhew that he confounded the two natures of Chriſt, and gave to his human nature the honour that was due to the logos. The emperor himſelf was ſo much impreſſed by the repreſentations of Neſtorius and his reſpectable partizans, that he wrote to Cyril, accuſing him of calumny, and of diſturbing the peace of the church. Cyril, however, remonſtrated, and perſuaded him to call a general council to decide concerning the matter in diſpute. Accordingly a council was ſummoned to be held at Epheſus A. D. 431,

SECT.

SECTION II.

Of the Council of Epheſus, and the Conſequences of it.

EPHESUS not being far from Conſtantinople, Neſtorius was firſt at the place, Cyril alſo was there before the time appointed for holding the council; but John biſhop of Antioch did not arrive in time, becauſe he had not been able to collect all the biſhops of his dioceſe. However, without waiting for them, Cyril took the place of preſident, which was thought to be improper, if not unfair, though he might plead that there was no other biſhop preſent whoſe ſee was ſo high in rank as his own, except Neſtorius himſelf, who was the perſon accuſed. But in equity, neither the *accuſed*, nor the *accuſer* ſhould have preſided, but ſome indifferent perſon.

The preſident and all the other biſhops having taken their places, the ſcriptures, according

cording to the cuſtom of thoſe times, were placed on a throne in the middle of the aſſembly, as the authority to which they all appealed, and then Neſtorius was called up. But though, ſince their arrival at the place, he had promiſed to be ready to attend, yet, after he had been ſummoned three times, he did not make his appearance, thoſe who were preſent proceeded to examine into the buſineſs without him. Then, having read the letters of Cyril, of Celeſtinus, and of Neſtorius himſelf on the ſubject, and having heard the evidence of what he was ſaid to have declared ſince his arrival at Epheſus, and which he had declared in his ſermons at Conſtantinople, viz. that "a child of two "or three months old could never be a God," they pronounced ſentence of depoſition againſt him, and it was ſigned by more than two hundred biſhops who compoſed this council.

At this council the twelve propoſitions of Cyril were confirmed, the ſubſtance of which is briefly expreſſed in the following explication ſubjoined to them. "The holy virgin "is the mother of God, not that the nature "of the logos, or the divinity, took its com-"mencement in the holy virgin, but becauſe

"that

" that ſacred body, animated by a reaſonable " ſoul, to which the logos of God was ſub- " ſtantially united, was carnally born of her." In other words, the *hypoſtatical union*, as it was afterwards generally called, of the logos with both the body and the ſoul of the man Jeſus, took place at the moment of conception.

Five days after this arrived John of Antioch with the biſhops of his dioceſe; and being highly offended at Cyril and the reſt for having acted without him, he formed them into a ſeparate ſynod, and pronounced a ſentence of depoſition againſt Cyril and Memnon biſhop of Epheſus. Alſo, ſome of theſe biſhops being Pelagians, they made a decree in favour of that doctrine. But theſe two biſhops appealing to the members of the original council, who were now joined by legates from the ſee of Rome, John was ſummoned to give an account of his proceedings againſt them; and not appearing after three days, Cyril and Memnon were abſolved from their ſentence, and on the other hand John and his biſhops were depoſed and excommunicated. They alſo made a decree againſt the Pelagian doctrine.

At

At firſt, Theodoſius, being prepoſſeſſed by the accounts of Neſtorius and his friends, did not approve of his depoſition, and at the ſuggeſtion of Acacius of Berea, then an hundred years old, he gave orders for the baniſhment of Neſtorius, Cyril, and Memnon, as equally diſturbers of the peace of the church. But the members of the council remonſtrating againſt the depoſition of Cyril and Memnon, he ordered ſeven biſhops on each ſide to appear before him at Conſtantinople, that by hearing both he might form a better judgment in the caſe. But being prepoſſeſſed againſt Neſtorius by his ſiſter Pulcheria, he for ſome time forbade his friends (of whom John of Antioch was one) to come any nearer than Chalcedon; ſaying that he would only ſee the other deputies. He was however ſo much preſſed, that at length he heard them all, but decided againſt Neſtorius. After this, by writing letters to Cyril and John of Antioch, he procured a reconciliation between them, and at length John joined in the depoſition of Neſtorius. In all this it muſt be acknowledged that the good natured emperor was governed chiefly by the princeſs Pulcheria, and as a teſtimony of her triumph in the cauſe of the virgin, ſhe built a magnificent

ficent church to her honour, at the port of Conſtantinople *.

We have ſeen ſufficient marks of faction, and of the influence of civil power in many of the preceding councils, and certainly they are no leſs apparent in this, which has obtained the title of the *third æcumenical or univerſal, council*, in which the doctrine of the hypoſtatical union of the two natures of Chriſt was eſtabliſhed. Had John of Antioch and his biſhops been preſent, it is poſſible that Neſtorius might have been acquitted, and Cyril condemned; and the ſigning of the condemnation of Neſtorius afterwards was never conſidered as the reſult of conviction. The whole buſineſs was in fact a conteſt between Neſtorius and Cyril; and the latter, by taking advantage of the abſence of the accuſed, and of a great proportion of the judges, and what was more than all, having the intereſt of the princeſs Pulcheria, gained his point.

Neſtorius at firſt got leave to retire to his own monaſtery, as he called it, near Antioch. Here he continued four years, and behaved in ſuch a manner as to gain the reſpect of every

* Evag. Lib. i. Cap. 4, 5. p. 253. Nycephori Hiſtoria, Lib. xv. Cap. 14. Vol. 2. p. 607.

body. But this not anſwering the purpoſe of his enemies, he was baniſhed to Oaſis in Egypt. This place being invaded by a people called Blemmyes, and Neſtorius with the other captives being diſmiſſed, he had leave to retire to Panopolis in Thebais. Afterwards he was removed by a guard of ſoldiers to Elephantina, at the extremity of Thebais. But being much fatigued and harraſſed by the journey, he returned to Panopolis and there he died, his tongue being ſaid to be eaten of worms. This was conſidered by his enemies as a judgment of God for his blaſphemies; and after dying this horrible death in this world, he went, they ſay, to a more grievous puniſhment in another*.

To read the ſolemn decrees of theſe councils, and the inſolent triumphs of thoſe who gained their point in them, one would think them to be omnipotent, and that they had the power of putting an end to all controverſies. Cyril, writing to his friend John, biſhop of Emeſa after this council of Epheſus, ſays, "Let the heavens rejoice, and let the "earth be glad. The middle wall of par-"tition is broken down. The conteſt is at

* Evag. Lib. i. Cap. 7. p. 256.

" an end. All occaſion of diſcord is removed. " Our Lord Jeſus Chriſt has given peace to " his church". But the Neſtorian hereſy, as it was called, was ſo far from ceaſing with this ſynod, that from this time it ſpread more than ever; and it prevails in the Eaſt to this day.

The Virgin Mary having in this ſolemn manner obtained the title of *the mother of God*, it is obſerved that from this time ſhe acquired a greater ſhare of reverence and attention than had ever been given to her before, though ſhe was not yet regularly worſhipped, as ſhe was in a later period.

SECTION III.

Of the Eutychian Controverſy till the Death of Theodoſius II. A. D. 456.

NOT long after the deciſion of the Neſtorian controverſy, viz. A. D. 448, two years before the death of Theodoſius, another and oppoſite hereſy, as it is commonly called, broke out, viz. that of Eutyches, an abbot of a monaſtery near Conſtantinople, and one of the moſt zealous oppoſers of Neſtorius. He was accuſed of holding heterodox opinions concerning the perſon of Chriſt, by Euſebius biſhop of Dorylæum, who being a profeſſor of rhetoric had before diſputed with Neſtorius.

A ſynod of thirty two biſhops being aſſembled at Conſtantinople to decide this affair, Eutyches at firſt did not appear, but afterwards he did; and when he was interrogated concerning his opinions, he held that before the union between the divine and human nature of Chriſt, they were properly *two*, but that after the union had taken place

place there was only *one nature*. He alſo maintained that the body of Chriſt was not of the ſame nature with that of other men. In conſequence of this he was condemned and depoſed. Appealing to the emperor, and alſo to Leo biſhop of Rome, and complaining in particular that the acts of this ſynod had been falſified by Flavianus biſhop of Conſtantinople, another ſynod was appointed to meet at this city, and Flavianus was heard on the ſubject. But though the acts of the former ſynod did not appear to have been falſified, another and more general council was appointed to meet to ſettle this buſineſs at Epheſus*.

At this ſynod, or council, were preſent Juvenalis biſhop of Jeruſalem, Domnus who had ſucceeded John biſhop of Antioch, and Julius a Weſtern biſhop, who acted as legate to Leo biſhop of Rome; and by the contrivance of Chryſaphius, who had much influence in the court of Theodoſius, Dioſcorus, who had ſucceeded Cyril as biſhop of Alexandria preſided. Flavianus alſo and the biſhops of his dioceſe were preſent. But as he and all the biſhops who had before condemned Eutyches were now conſidered as perſons accuſed

* Evag. Lib. i. Cap. 9. p. 261.

of irregular proceedings, they were not allowed to have any vote; and the diſpoſition of the emperor in favour of Eutyches being well known, he was reſtored, and his adverſaries, Flavianus and Euſebius of Dorylæum were condemned and depoſed, together with Ibas biſhop of Edeſſa, Theodoret of Cyrus, Domnus of Antioch, Daniel of Carrhæ, Irenæus of Tyre, and Aquilinus of Biblos *.

There were, however, great complaints of irregularity and unfairneſs in the proceedings of this council. A letter which Leo wrote in refutation of the errors of Eutyches was not allowed to be read, ſo that his legates retired, and proteſted againſt the proceedings. It is alſo ſaid that the biſhops who were againſt Eutyches being refractory, Dioſcorus, who favoured him, entered the place of aſſembly with a number of ſoldiers, and many monks (who almoſt univerſally took the part of Eutyches, as one of their body) with one Barſumas, a man of a violent character, at their head, and by threats and actual force compelled them to adopt their meaſures; and it was with ſome difficulty that the pope's legates made their eſcape and got to Rome. Moreover, not content with depoſing Flavi-

* Evag. Lib. i. Cap. 10. p. 261.

anus,

anus, Dioſcorus and Barſumas falling upon him with their fiſts, bruiſed him in ſuch a manner, that he died in a few days. As a proof that Barſumas intended to murder him, it was alleged that he was heard to cry out on the occaſion, *kill him, kill him**.

The buſineſs of Eutyches did not end with Theodoſius, who died by a fall from his horſe in hunting, A. D. 450, after a reign of thirty eight years. He was a prince of great piety, but weak, and conſequently governed by thoſe about him. He left only one daughter, who was married to Valentinian III. His ſiſter Pulcheria, who had been declared Auguſta, and reigned along with him, choſe for her huſband Marcian, a native of Thrace, on account of his excellent qualifications and great virtues, on condition that he ſhould be content with the empire, and the name only of her huſband†.

* Evag. Lib. ii. Cap. 18. p. 325.
† Ibid. Cap. 1. p. 280.

SECTION IV.

Of the Council of Chalcedon, A. D. 451.

THEODOSIUS, who had favoured Eutyches, being dead, the aſpect of things with reſpect to him ſoon changed. Marcian, preſently after his acceſſion, received letters from Leo, biſhop of Rome, complaining that his epiſtle had not been read in the council at Epheſus. Thoſe biſhops alſo who thought themſelves injured by Dioſcorus, requeſted that their cauſe might be heard in a full council, but none of them was ſo urgent as Euſebius biſhop of Dorylæum, who ſaid that himſelf and Flavianus had been depoſed in conſequence of the intrigues of Chryſaphius, who had been offended becauſe when he demanded a ſum of money for his ordination, he, to ſhew him the impropriety of his conduct, had ſent him the ſacred veſſels of his church. He alſo complained that Flavianus had died of the attack that had been made upon him, and alſo that Chryſaphius and his party

party were of the ſame opinion with Eutyches. On this account Marcian ſummoned a general council to meet at Chalcedon, A.D. 451.

At this council, which conſiſted of three hundred and ſixty biſhops, there were preſent the legates of Leo, Anatolius biſhop of Conſtantinople, Dioſcorus of Alexandria, Maximus of Antioch, Juvenalis of Jeruſalem, and the biſhops depending upon them. The legates of Leo began with objecting to Dioſcorus having a ſeat along with them, becauſe, without the leave of their maſter, he had preſumed to preſide in the council at Epheſus. But this was not allowed to be a ſufficient objection, and therefore it was determined that Dioſcorus had a right to his ſeat. In the next place Euſebius deſired to be heard againſt Dioſcorus, for having been the cauſe of the death of Flavianus, and his own unjuſt depoſition, requeſting that the council would judge between them.

After theſe preliminaries, the acts of the council at Epheſus were read, and the caſe of Dioſcorus being examined, it appeared that he had been the cauſe of the rejection of the epiſtle of Leo, and of the depoſition of Flavianus, by compelling the Fathers of the coun-

SECTION IV.

Of the Council of Chalcedon, A. D. 451.

THEODOSIUS, who had favoured Eutyches, being dead, the aſpect of things with reſpect to him ſoon changed. Marcian, preſently after his acceſſion, received letters from Leo, biſhop of Rome, complaining that his epiſtle had not been read in the council at Epheſus. Thoſe biſhops alſo who thought themſelves injured by Dioſcorus, requeſted that their cauſe might be heard in a full council, but none of them was ſo urgent as Euſebius biſhop of Dorylæum, who ſaid that himſelf and Flavianus had been depoſed in conſequence of the intrigues of Chryſaphius, who had been offended becauſe when he demanded a ſum of money for his ordination, he, to ſhew him the impropriety of his conduct, had ſent him the ſacred veſſels of his church. He alſo complained that Flavianus had died of the attack that had been made upon him, and alſo that Chryſaphius and his party

party were of the ſame opinion with Eutyches. On this account Marcian ſummoned a general council to meet at Chalcedon, A.D. 451.

At this council, which conſiſted of three hundred and ſixty biſhops, there were preſent the legates of Leo, Anatolius biſhop of Conſtantinople, Dioſcorus of Alexandria, Maximus of Antioch, Juvenalis of Jeruſalem, and the biſhops depending upon them. The legates of Leo began with objecting to Dioſcorus having a ſeat along with them, becauſe, without the leave of their maſter, he had preſumed to preſide in the council at Epheſus. But this was not allowed to be a ſufficient objection, and therefore it was determined that Dioſcorus had a right to his ſeat. In the next place Euſebius deſired to be heard againſt Dioſcorus, for having been the cauſe of the death of Flavianus, and his own unjuſt depoſition, requeſting that the council would judge between them.

After theſe preliminaries, the acts of the council at Epheſus were read, and the caſe of Dioſcorus being examined, it appeared that he had been the cauſe of the rejection of the epiſtle of Leo, and of the depoſition of Flavianus, by compelling the Fathers of the coun-

cil to ſign a blank paper, to which the ſentence of depoſition was afterwards prefixed. For theſe reaſons the biſhops of this council depoſed Dioſcorus, and together with him Juvenalis of Jeruſalem, Thalaſſius of Cæſarea in Cappadocia, Euſebius of Ancyra, Euſtathius of Berytus, and Baſil of Seleucia in Iſauria, for concurring with him in thoſe unjuſt proceedings.

In the next place the legates of the Pope having repeated their maſter's complaints againſt Dioſcorus (to which they added his preſuming to excommunicate the Pope, while he himſelf ſtood charged by the ſynod with many great crimes, and receiving thoſe who had been excommunicated for juſt reaſons into his communion) ſaid, "For theſe reaſons "the moſt holy and bleſſed Leo, archbiſhop "of Rome ſenior, by us, and the preſent "ſynod, together with the apoſtle Peter, "worthy of all praiſe, the baſis of the catho-"lic church, and the foundation of the right "faith, depoſeth him from his epiſcopal dig-"nity and every clerical office." This ſentence, which I recite verbatim as a ſpecimen of the claims of Leo, and of ſuch excommunications as all the biſhops of the greater ſees in that age paſſed upon one another, was con-

firmed

firmed by this council, without which it would have had no effect. And thoſe who had been depoſed by Dioſcorus were reſtored to their former dignities.

Theſe affairs being diſpatched, the Fathers of this council proceeded to the diſcuſſion of the articles of faith, the reſult of which was their condemnation of the opinion of thoſe who ſaid that what was born of Mary was a *mere man*, and their approbation of the ſynodical letters of Cyril, by which they cenſured the doctrine of Neſtorius. They likewiſe gave their ſanction to the epiſtle of Leo, ſent to the council of Epheſus, as equally confuting thoſe who made *two ſons of God* (which was ſaid to be the conſequence of the opinion of Neſtorius) and thoſe who, with Eutyches, maintained that the deity of the Son was liable to ſuffer; thoſe who ſaid that there was a mixture or confuſion of the two natures of Chriſt, who ſaid that his fleſh was of ſome celeſtial ſubſtance, or any other than human, or that, though before the union there were two natures of Chriſt, there was but one after it.

After the ſolemn condemnation of theſe particular opinions, they give a definition of their own faith, in which they acknowledge Chriſt

Chriſt to be " perfect God and perfect man, " conſubſtantial with the Father as to his divi- " nity, and conſubſtantial with man as to his " humanity; having two natures, without con- " fuſion, or one of them being changed into " the other, indiviſibly and inſeparably united; " the difference of the natures not being loſt " in the union, but joined in one perſon or hy- " poſtaſis." It was then determined that, whoever ſhould profeſs any other faith than this, if they were biſhops, they ſhould be depoſed, if they were of the inferior clergy, they ſhould be degraded, and if monks or laymen excommunicated.

This being ſettled, the emperor came to Chalcedon, and entering the place of aſſembly, he made a ſpeech to the biſhops, in which he exhorted them to peace and concord. After this they had other meetings to ſettle differences between particular perſons, and ſome other matters of leſs conſequence. Theodoret, having pronounced an anathema againſt Neſtorius, whoſe opinion he was thought to have favoured, was reſtored to his ſee; as alſo was Ibas, in conſequence of their reſcinding all the decrees of the council of Epheſus, except the ordination of Maximus biſhop of Antioch. In the laſt place it was

agreed, that the ſee of Conſtantinople ſhould rank next to that of Rome*.

Leo was highly provoked at the deciſion of this council in favour of the biſhop of Conſtantinople, and vehemently exclaimed againſt the arrogance and preſumption of Anaſtatius, and though he confirmd the other decrees of the council, he rejected this, pronouncing it abſolutely null by the authority, as he ſaid, of the apoſtle Peter†. He urged that the church of Conſtantinople was not founded by any apoſtle, and he thought that the decrees of this council infringed upon thoſe of the council of Nice, which he thought, it his duty to defend‡. It is evident, however, that he miſinterpreted the canons of the council of Nice.

* Evag. Lib. ii. Cap. 4. p. 286. Cap. 18. p. 309.
† Cave's Hiſt. Lib. i. Vol. 1. p. 431.
‡ Dupin Vol. 4. p. 96.

SECTION V.

The Conſequences of the Council of Chalcedon till the Death of Marcian A. D. 457.

THE proceedings of this great council, *the fourth* which has obtained the title of *æcumenical*, or univerſal, in which the known diſpoſition of the emperor had the ſame decided influence as in any other preceding council, and the proceedings of which were in many reſpects conducted with much clamour and confuſion, were far from giving univerſal ſatisfaction, eſpecially to the numerous friends of Eutyches and Dioſcorus, who was baniſhed to Gangræ in Paphlagonia. Both in Egypt and Paleſtine there were dangerous inſurrections, and much blood was ſhed in conſequence of them. Proterius ſucceeding to Dioſcorus, the friends of the latter roſe in arms, and inſulted the ſoldiers and magiſtrates who were appointed to execute the orders of the council; and when many of the ſoldiers were obliged to take refuge in a building which had been the temple

of Serapis, the people ſet fire to the place, and burned them in it. Upon this two thouſand new raiſed ſoldiers were ſent to Alexandria, and their irregularities with reſpect to the wives and daughters of the citizens being the occaſion of more miſchief than all that had happened before, the people were not pacified till the governor gave way to them, by granting them the uſual diſtribution of corn, and the uſe of the baths, ſpectacles, &c. of which they had been deprived on account of this tumult.

Eutyches having gone to the monks in the neighbourhood of Jeruſalem, and complained to them that the true faith had been betrayed at the council of Chalcedon, inflamed them to the higheſt degree. They compelled Juvenalis, who had been reſtored by this council, to anathematize the decrees of it; and not content with this, they put in his place a monk of the name of Theodoſius, who had made much diſturbance in the council, and had brought the firſt news of the iſſue of it. In this buſineſs Theodoſius and his friends are ſaid to have committed great outrages, and even many murders. But notwithſtanding this, being ſupported by Eudocia, the widow of the emperor Theodoſius (who

(who however is ſaid to have renounced Eutychianiſm before ſhe died) he held the ſee of Jeruſalem twenty months, and ordained many biſhops. At length, the emperor to whom Juvenalis had fled, interpoſed, and compelled the church to receive him, and to expel the biſhops who had been ordained by Theodoſius*.

Theodoſius himſelf fled to mount Sinai; and when his accomplices, joined by Eudocea, wrote to the emperor in his favour, he made a very proper reply; reproving them for the diſorders of which they had been the occaſion, and requiring their ſubmiſſion to their biſhop Juvenalis, who, he ſaid, had interceded for them.

Marcian, ſeeing there were perſons who endeavoured to extenuate the authority of the council of Chalcedon, made a new edict to ſupport and confirm it; and by another edict he cancelled every thing that had been done againſt Flavianus, and ordered that due honour ſhould be paid to his memory. Not content with this, he iſſued another edict againſt the Eutychians by name, in which he ſubjected them to all the penalties which had been inflicted upon the Apollinariſts, forbade

* Evag. Lib. ii. Cap. 5. p. 292.

them

them to create biſhops, prieſts, or clergy, to make aſſemblies of monks, to build monaſteries, to receive or to bequeath any legacies, or to be enrolled in the army. He baniſhed from the empire the monks belonging to the monaſtery of Eutyches at Conſtantinople, and ordered that it ſhall no longer bear his name, becauſe it had ſerved for a retreat to the enemies of religion. He moreover ordered all the books written in favour of that hereſy to be burnt, and the authors of them to be baniſhed; and likewiſe that thoſe who ſhould teach this hereſy ſhould be puniſhed with death, and thoſe who ſhould be aſſembled to hear it pay a fine of ten pounds of gold.

Notwithſtanding all theſe ſevere edicts, Eutychianiſm prevailed more than ever in the patriarchates of Antioch and Alexandria, and there it continues to this day *. Eutychianiſm was ſo generally received in Alexandria, that the emperor iſſued an expreſs edict to oblige all the people of that place to receive the decrees of the four œcumenical councils, viz. thoſe of Nice, Conſtantinople, Epheſus, and Chalcedon, and ſubjected the Eutychians to the puniſhments inflicted on all other heretics †.

* Sueur, A. D. 453. † Ibid. A. D. 454.

On

On the death of Marcian, after a reign of ſeven years, Dionyſius, the military commander, being in Upper Egypt, the people of Alexandria ſet upon Proterius their biſhop, and though he fled into the baptiſtery of the church, they ſeized him, and put him to death, together with ſix other perſons. They then dragged his body with ropes, and having inſulted it in this manner, burned it. It was ſaid, however, by ſome that Proterius had brought this upon himſelf by his own violence, and that he was not killed by the people, but by ſome ſoldiers. In his place the people choſe for their biſhop Timotheus Ælurus, who had been a monk, and was then a preſbyter of the church.

SEC.

SECTION VI.

Tranſactions relating to Eutychianiſm, ſubſequent to the Acceſſion of Leo the Thracian, A. D. 474.

LEO the Thracian, who had ſucceeded Marcian, being informed of the diſturbances in Egypt, directed a circular letter to all the metropolitan biſhops, and alſo to the Abbots, or heads of monaſteries, acquainting them with what had happened, and requiring them to call ſynods of the biſhops of their reſpective diſtricts, and to give him their opinion concerning the council of Chalcedon, and the ordination of Timotheus. In conſequence of this Leo biſhop of Rome, and all the other metropolitan biſhops, aſſembled their ſeparate ſynods; and in all of them the ordination of Timotheus was condemned as irregular, and the decrees of the council of Chalcedon were confirmed. There was, however, one diſſenting voice, viz. Amphilochius biſhop of Sida, who diſapproved, indeed, of the ordination of Timotheus, but condemned the decrees of the council of Chalcedon, though ſome time after he acknowledged their authority.

Among the letters which were written on this occaſion, and which have been preſerved, there is one of Simeon Stylites, a monk, who is ſaid to have lived many years on a pillar, expoſed to all the inclemencies of the weather, and to have been highly reſpected in this ſuperſtitious age on that account; and in his letter I find, for the firſt time, the idea of the ſpirit of God being preſent in councils, and influencing their decrees. "If," ſays he, our "Saviour be preſent with two or three of his "diſciples, how much more will the ſpirit of "God be preſent with ſo many biſhops as "were aſſembled at Chalcedon." In conſequence of theſe proceedings, Timotheus was baniſhed to Gangræ, and the people of Alexandria choſe another biſhop of the name of Timotheus, ſurnamed Baſilius according to ſome, and Salofaciolus according to others*.

That the Eutychian doctrine was popular at Antioch, as well as at Alexandria, is evident from the reception which was there given to Peter Fullo, a preſbyter of the church of Chalcedon, but who had been a monk, and who, like the monks in general, was a favourer of Eutyches; but he was ſaid to have

* Evag. Lib. ii. Cap. 8, 9, 10, 11. p. 297, &c.

been

been expelled from the monaſtery for his irregularities. This man, however, having the favour of the emperor Zeno (who ſucceeded Leo, after a reign of only ten months) ſeized upon the ſee of Antioch, while Martyrius, the regular biſhop, was at Conſtantinople, and he was confirmed in it by the order of the emperor. Before this time it had been the cuſtom of many churches of the Eaſt, in imitation, it is ſuppoſed, of the form of adoration in Iſaiah vi. 3. *Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord God of hoſts*, and in Revelation iv. 8. *Holy, holy, holy, Lord God almighty*, to prefix, or to add, theſe words to their hymns, with the addition of other epithets, as follows, "Holy God, holy almighty, holy immortal, "have mercy upon us," and by this they imagined that the three perſons in the Trinity were characterized. To this *Triſagion* (which this form of invocation was called) Fullo, and probably other monks who were attached to Eutychianiſm, and who thought that the whole nature of Chriſt became divine after the union of the two natures (the leſs being wholly abſorbed in the greater, as a drop of oil would be in the ocean) and who conſequently maintained that the divine nature of Chriſt ſuffered, uſed to add, "who was crucified for us."

This made Fullo ſo exceedingly popular, that he not only got himſelf made biſhop of Antioch, but ordained one John biſhop of Apamea. And though the emperor ordered Fullo to be baniſhed, and Martyrius to be reſtored, the latter found the people ſo much divided, and the majority, no doubt, ſo greatly againſt him, that he choſe to reſign, and contented himſelf with being a ſimple preſbyter. Fullo, continuing a biſhop, openly anathematized the council of Chalcedon, and taught that the divinity ſuffered on the croſs.

Baſilicus, who for ſome time ſupplanted Zeno, was the avowed advocate of Eutychianiſm, and in conſequence of circular letters which he wrote for the purpoſe, no leſs than five hundred biſhops joined in acquitting Eutyches, and in the condemnation of the epiſtle of Leo, and of the decrees of the council of Chalcedon*. Afterwards, indeed, Baſilicus found himſelf obliged to retract his circular letter. But ſtill the fact ſhews that the biſhops were always ready to go with the court, that is, to be ſwayed by their intereſt, and therefore that the real faith of the chriſtian church in any period, or even the opinions of the biſhops themſelves, are by no means to be

* Evag. Lib. iii. Cap. 5. p. 338.

collected

collected from the decrees of these solemn councils. Had the succeeding emperors been disposed to favour Eutychianism, as much as Eudocia, Zeno, and Basilicus, there can be no doubt but that this famous council of Chalcedon would have been deemed as spurious as the second of Ephesus.

SECTION VII.

General Observations on the four Oecumenical Councils.

WE are now come to the termination of the last four boasted *æcumenical* (or *general*) *councils*, the decrees of which have been the standard of orthodoxy, with respect to the doctrine of the trinity, from that time to the present, in all established churches, and which are equally acknowledged by the Greeks and the Latins. I shall therefore in this place give a general retrospective view of the decisions of each of them.

In the council of Nice it was determined that the Son was *of the ſame ſubſtance* with the Father, in that of Conſtantinople, that both the Son and the Holy Spirit are, in all reſpects, *equal* to the Father; in that of Epheſus, that the *two natures* of Chriſt make but *one perſon*, and in that of Chalcedon, that theſe natures continue to be two, notwithſtanding this perſonal, or hypoſtatical union between them.

With reſpect to the doctrine of the two firſt councils, I would obſerve that the ideas are clear enough; as we very well know what is meant by *ſameneſs of ſubſtance*, and alſo by *equality* with reſpect to power, rank, &c. But the language of the two ſucceeding councils conveys no diſtinct ideas at all; becauſe we cannot poſſibly conceive how two beings, or ſubſtances, ſo different as thoſe of God and man, can be properly *united;* or if they be united, what kind of union it will be; and though the differences in this caſe may be diſtinguiſhed by the words *nature* and *perſon*, we have no ideas correſponding to that verbal difference.

Neſtorius and Eutyches equally maintained that Chriſt was both *God* and *man;* but the former was cenſured for making the God and

the man to conſtitute *two perſons*, and the latter for ſaying that, after this intimate perſonal union, there was but *one nature*. Since, however, it is impoſſible to give any definitions of the terms *perſon* and *nature* in theſe propoſitions, the difference between theſe two oppoſite hereſies, as they are always called, is merely verbal, ſo that the controverſy is about words only; and yet for ſuch a difference as this, which it is impoſſible for any man to underſtand, or explain, have whole bodies of chriſtians anathematized one another for ages.

I would farther obſerve, that rational metaphyſics would have prevented the deciſions of all theſe celebrated councils; ſince, where they are intelligible, they are logically ſpeaking, *abſurd*, involving real contradictions.

That the Son is of the ſame ſubſtance with the Father, was an inference from his having been originally the proper *reaſon of the Father*, and afterwards perſonified. But that any *attribute* ſhould become a *ſeparate perſon*, and eſpecially that the Being whoſe attribute it was, ſhould not after this event be deprived of it, is a manifeſt abſurdity. It is ſtill more ſo to ſuppoſe that three perſons ſhould

be all of them, ſeparately conſidered, poſſeſſed of all the ſame attributes of divinity, and in the ſame extent, and yet not be *three Gods*, or three beings poſſeſſed of all the requiſites of divinity; becauſe we have no different ideas to annex to the terms *perſon* and *being* in this caſe. The ſame good ſenſe and rational metaphyſics would have prevented all diſputes about the terms *nature* and *perſon*, in the Neſtorian and Eutychian controverſies.

In fact, if we ſet aſide the doctrine of Arius, or that of a great pre-exiſtent intelligent Being, ſupplying the place of a human ſoul in the perſon of Chriſt (which its late riſe alone excludes from all pretenſions to be the original and apoſtolical doctrine) rational metaphyſics admit of no other than the ſimple Unitarian doctrine, of Chriſt being a man inſpired by God. And this is abundantly ſufficient for all the purpoſes of the chriſtian diſpenſation, and indeed has infinitely greater propriety, and conſequently greater effect, than any other ſcheme whatever; eſpecially as it makes Chriſt to be, in the proper ſenſe of the words, *the firſt-born among many brethren*, and *in all reſpects like unto them*, ſo as to be a proper pattern of the reſurrection of man to a future immortal life; to teach and

to

to exemplify which was the great object of his miſſion.

Beſides, if we ſay, what this doctrine ſuppoſes, that God was properly with Chriſt, and acted by him, which he himſelf declared, when he ſaid that *of himſelf he could do nothing*, and that *the Father within him did the works*, it has the ſame advantage, and effect, as the ſuppoſition of his being God himſelf; becauſe the *power*, though not the *perſon*, was that of God. There is therefore no good reaſon for contending that Chriſt himſelf, perſonally conſidered, ſhould be God, unleſs it ſhould be maintained that his ſuffering as a God was neceſſary to the redemption of the world, which thoſe who hold the doctrine of the divinity of Chriſt always diſclaim; ſince they acknowledge that he ſuffered as a man only, the divine nature being incapable of ſuffering.

It is ſaid, indeed, that the union between theſe two natures is ſuch, as to give a peculiar value to the ſufferings of that part of Jeſus which was capable of ſuffering. But ſince it is acknowledged not to be ſo great as to admit of both the natures ſuffering together, ſuch an union as that which the Unitarians ſuppoſe to have been between the ſupreme

preme God and the man Jeſus (which is all the union of which we can form any idea) may, for any thing that we know, be ſufficient for this purpoſe alſo. But the whole doctrine of atonement for the ſins of men by the ſufferings of any ſuperior Being whatever, and the ſuppoſition that God does not forgive ſins *freely*, on account of the repentance and reformation of the ſinner (which is the uniform doctrine of the ſcriptures, and what is always recommended to our imitation) implies the greateſt reflection on the character of the ſupreme Being; and when properly attended to muſt have an unfavourable effect on the minds of his worſhippers.

The deciſions of theſe councils had no effect beſides what the civil power gave them. Arianiſm was ſo far from being extinguiſhed, that it even increaſed, after the council of Nice, and it continued long after that of Chalcedon. Beſides, it was received by all the Northern nations which were not ſubject to the Roman power. It is equally true that the council of Epheſus was little more than the date of the origin of Neſtorianiſm, and the council of Chalcedon that of Eutychianiſm; and to this day Neſtorianiſm is the profeſſed doctrine of one part of the Eaſt,

and

and Eutychianiſm of another; and ſince the fall of the Greek empire, the adherents to theſe ſects are perhaps equal in number to thoſe who are called catholics among the Greeks.

SECTION VIII.

Tranſactions of a civil Nature in the Weſt, from the Death of Honorius to the Fall of the Empire.

WITH the account of this famous council of Chalcedon, which brings the ſtate of opinions with reſpect to the perſon of Chriſt to an important period, I cloſe my hiſtory of the Eaſtern church, and proceed to relate what remains of eccleſiaſtical tranſactions in the Weſt. But from the death of Honorius nothing of much importance occurs till after the period to which I now confine myſelf. I ſhall therefore do little more than give the outline of what happened after the death of Honorius, that we may ſee in what manner this great empire (the civil tranſactions of which had always the cloſeſt con-

connexion with the eccleſiaſtical ones) fell into total diſſolution.

On the death of Honorius, John, his chief ſecretary, aſſumed the purple in Rome; but Theodoſius, ſending an army againſt him, defeated him, and put him to death, and then declared his couſin Valentinian III. emperor, his mother Placidia being regent during his minority. In this reign Boniface, who commanded in Africa, being ſuſpected of endeavouring to make himſelf independant, was induced to revolt, and to invite Genſeric king of the Vandals (who were at that time in poſſeſſion of Spain) to join him. Accordingly, the year following, which was A. D. 439, this prince croſſed the ſea, and though Boniface, whoſe innocence had in the mean time been made to appear, would have perſuaded him to return, he purſued his advantage till he had reduced the whole country.

A. D. 447, the northern parts of Italy, were ravaged by Attila King of the Huns; but Valentinian agreeing to pay him an annual penſion, he withdrew, and ſettled beyond the Danube. A. D. 455, Valentinian having debauched the wife of Maximus, one of his officers, the latter entered into a conſpiracy againſt him; and having put him to death,

cauſed

cauſed himſelf to be proclaimed emperor. But having compelled Eudocia, the empreſs, to marry him, ſhe invited Genſeric to invade Italy; and upon his arrival Maximus fled, and was killed. Genſeric plundered Rome, and carried away an incredible number of captives, and among them Eudocia herſelf.

On the death of Maximus, Theodoric king of the Viſigoths, who were then ſettled in Gaul, cauſed Avitus, who was then an ambaſſador at his court, to be proclaimed emperor. But when he had reigned ſcarcely fourteen months, he was depoſed by Ricimer, who had the command of the Roman fleet, and who had juſt before defeated that of Genſeric. After an interregnum of three months, he proclaimed Majorianus emperor; but being jealous of his reputation, he put him to death, and in about three months advanced Severus, a native of Lucania, to the ſame dignity. He dying in conſequence of poiſon given him, as ſuppoſed, by Ricimer, the latter, after two years, promoted Anthemius, who had married the only daughter of Marcian, to the empire, and married his daughter. A. D. 472 Ricimer revolted from Anthemius, and taking Rome, committed more ravages in it than either Alaric or Genſeric had done. He then put Anthemius to death and cauſed

Olybrius

Olybrius to be proclaimed in his room, and he died a natural death not long after, as Ricimer himſelf did a little before him.

The following ſpring, A. D. 473, Glycerius, who had been Comes Domeſticorum, took the title of emperor at Ravenna. But the year following Julius Nepos, having been proclaimed emperor of the Weſt by Leo emperor of the Eaſt, ſurprized Glycerius, and diveſting him of the purple, compelled him to become biſhop of Salonæ in Dalmatia. After this Oreſtes, his general, revolting from him, made his own ſon Auguſtulus emperor; and Nepos being obliged to fly, took refuge with Glycerius. But the barbarians who had ſerved in the Roman armies being refuſed by Oreſtes that ſettlement in Italy, which they had demanded as the reward of their ſervices, choſe Odoacer for their leader; and he, beſieging Oreſtes in Pavia, took the the place, and put him to death. After this he took Auguſtulus in Ravenna, but ſpared him on account of his youth, and then proclaimed himſelf *king of Italy*, A.D. 473, in conſequence of which an end was put to the very name of the *Roman empire* in the Weſt.

SEC-

SECTION IX.

Tranſactions of an Eccleſiaſtical Nature in the Weſt, from the Death of Honorius to the Fall of the Weſtern Empire.

DURING theſe commotions and revolutions, little was done in eccleſiaſtical matters, except what has been mentioned with reſpect to the Pelagians in Gaul.

The Vandals, who, as well as the Goths, and other northern nations, were Arians, having got poſſeſſion of Africa, perſecuted the orthodox, baniſhing all the biſhops of that perſuaſion from their ſees, as Theodoſius in his time treated the Arian biſhops in his dominions; and it is ſaid that the Donatiſts joined the Arians in their perſecution of the catholics. The Vandals alſo perſecuted the Manichæans, who took refuge in Rome, where, however, they were vehemently oppoſed by Leo, who was likewiſe the great enemy of the Pelagians; and Valentinian the emperor ſeconding all his views, he called

ed

ed a ſynod, which ordered all the Manichæans to be puniſhed as heretics. The Vandals, however, were as zealous chriſtians as the catholics; for it is acknowledged that they deſtroyed all remains of heatheniſm in Africa.

The authority of the ſee of Rome was greatly advanced in this period by Leo, who, countenanced in this, as well as in every thing elſe, by the emperor Valentinian, encouraged appeals to the church of Rome; and aſſerted the dignity and prerogatives of it as due to the apoſtles Peter and Paul, who had been its founders; alleging that as Peter was the chief and ſovereign among the apoſtles, his ſucceſſors ought to be the ſame among other biſhops.

Notwithſtanding the emperors had exempted Illyricum, which was ſituated between Rome and Conſtantinople, from the juriſdiction of the former, and had ſubjected it to the latter, Leo laid claim to that province, and made Anaſtaſius biſhop of Theſſalonica his vicar in it.

But he gained a great acceſſion of power on occaſion of the following diſputes in Gaul. Hilary of Arles, and Germain of Auxerre, coming, in a journey which they made together, to a city in the province

of Vienna, of which Celidonius was biſhop, the people of the place accuſed him before them of having married a widow, and of having condemned ſome perſons to death when he was a magiſtrate. In conſequence of this, theſe biſhops aſſembled others in that neighbourhood, and it was agreed among them that Celidonius ſhould of his own accord reſign his biſhopric. But he appealed to the pope, who, in a council of his biſhops in Italy, held A. D. 444, ordered him to be reinſtated.

Farther, complaint being made of an irregular ordination by Hilary, Leo procured an order from another of his ſynods that he ſhould no more exerciſe any authority in his own province, or even be preſent at any ordination; and intereſting Valentinian in his favour, he procured the following law, dictated, it is ſuppoſed, by himſelf.

"It is certain that the only ſafeguard of "our empire is the favour of the ſupreme "Deity, which is ſecured by the chriſtian "faith, and true religion. Conſidering then "that the merit of St. Peter, who was the "prince of biſhops, the dignity of the city "of Rome, and the authority of the ſacred "ſynod, have eſtabliſhed the ſupremacy

"of the apoſtolic ſee, let nothing be attempt-
"ed againſt its authority. For then only
"will the peace of the churches be preſerved
"when the univerſe acknowledges its go-
"vernor." Then, having condemned Hilary of Arles for having ordained ſome biſhops without conſulting the pope, he ſays, "we "have decreed by a perpetual ordinance, "that neither the biſhops of Gaul, nor thoſe "of the other provinces, do any thing with-"out the authority of the venerable pope of "the eternal city; but that whatever ſhall be "ordered by the authority of the apoſtolical "ſee, ſhall be a law to all others; ſo that "whoever of the biſhops, on being ſum-"moned, ſhall neglect to appear before the "tribunal of the Roman prelate, he ſhall be "compelled to make his appearance by the "governor of the province, &c.*"

By this law an end was put to the ancient liberties of the Gallican churches. From this time appeals to Rome from all the Weſtern churches became frequent, and vicars, or legates, of the *holy ſee*, as it was called, were often ſeen beyond the Alps. But the churches in the Eaſt were never in ſubjection to the ſee

* Le Sueur A. D. 445. Hiſtorie des Popes, Vol. ii. p. 225, &c.

of

of Rome. In what manner, after this great ſtep made by Leo, the fall of the Roman empire in the Weſt made way for the farther aggrandizement of the biſhops of Rome, may be ſeen in a future period.

Thus far the Eaſtern and Weſtern churches acted very much in concert, ſo that all the decrees of the general councils are conſidered as equally binding upon them both. But from this time the civil affairs of the Weſt having little connexion with thoſe of the Eaſt, the two churches became wholly ſeparated.

SECTION X.

Of Writers within this Period.

CYRIL of Alexandria was nephew to Theophilus, the great perſecutor of Chryſoſtom, as he himſelf was the great oppoſer of Neſtorius. He was a very voluminous writer. Beſides commentaries on many parts of ſcripture, we have of his ſeventeen books on worſhipping in ſpirit and in truth, ſeveral tracts relating to the doctrine of the tri-

nity againſt Neſtorius. Three paſchal homilies, ten books againſt Julian, one againſt the anthropomorphites, and ſixty one epiſtles.

Oroſius, a preſbyter of Tarraco in Spain, was ſent as ambaſſador to inform Auſtin concerning the Priſcillianiſts, and by him he was ſent to Jerome in Paleſtine to aſk his opinion concerning the origin of ſouls. There he attended two councils, in which he endeavoured to expoſe the hereſy of Pelagius. The year after he returned to Africa with the relics of St. Stephen, and thence he went to Spain, where, in purſuance of the requeſt of Auſtin, he wrote his *hiſtory*, conſiſting of ſeven books, the object of which is to ſhew that the Romans ſuffered greater calamities while they were heathens, then after the empire became chriſtian. He alſo wrote an apology againſt the Pelagians, on the freedom of the will, and a tract on the error of the Priſcillianiſts and Origeniſts, which is prefixed to a book of Auſtin's againſt the former.

Theodoret was a native of Antioch, and was educated in a monaſtery near that city. Here he contracted an intimate friendſhip with Neſtorius, and with John, afterwards biſhop of Antioch. His maſters are ſaid to have

have been Theodorus, biſhop of Mopſueſtia, and Chryſoſtom. After being made deacon in the church of Antioch, he was ordained biſhop of Cyrus, near the Euphrates, a diſtrict which abounded with heretics, whom he was indefatigable in converting. He boaſted that he had baptized ten thouſand Marcionites. We have ſeen the danger that Theodoret brought himſelf into by his attachment to Neſtorius, and his oppoſition to Cyril; but being acquitted of hereſy by Leo, biſhop of Rome, he was reſtored to his ſee by Marcian. After the council of Chalcedon he applied himſelf to writing, and the works of few of the Fathers now extant are more valuable than his. His commentaries on the ſcriptures have more good ſenſe in them than any thing of the kind that has come down to us of the early ages. Beſides theſe, we have of him five books of eccleſiaſtical hiſtory, as many of heretical fables, and a hiſtory of monks; twelve books againſt the heathens, particularly Julian, ten orations concerning providence, four books of dialogues on the ſubject of the trinity; ſeven other dialogues, two of them againſt the Anomœans, three againſt the Macedonians, and two againſt the Apollinariſts; and, laſtly, thirty four epiſtles.

Caſſian was of Scythian extraction, born at Athens. After being brought up from very early years among the monks of Bethlehem, he was made deacon by Chryſoſtom at Conſtantinople. On the expulſion of his patron he was ſent by him to plead his cauſe with Innocent biſhop of Rome. There he was made a preſbyter, and upon the city being taken by the Goths, he went to Marſeilles, where he founded two monaſteries, one for men, and the other for women, and was a ſtrenuous defender of the Semipelagian doctrine. We have of his a work in twelve books of monkiſh inſtitutions, ſeven books on the incarnation of Chriſt againſt Neſtorius, and collections from the Fathers.

Socrates was a native of Conſtantinople. He learned grammar of Helladius and Ammonius, who fled from Alexandria, as has been already mentioned, and rhetoric of Troilus the ſophiſt. For ſome time he applied to the bar, whence he got the appellation of *Scholaſticus*. He is the author of a very valuable eccleſiaſtical hiſtory from the time of Conſtantine, to A.D. 439. This work bears the marks of great diligence and impartiality.

Hermias Sozomen, probably a native of Paleſtine, ſtudied the law at Berytus, and pleaded

pleaded cauſes at Conſtantinople. He is alſo the author of an eccleſiaſtical hiſtory, of nearly the ſame period with that of Socrates. But though his work is ſaid to be written with more elegance, he is not generally thought to be quite ſo judicious. I do not think, however, that, in this reſpect, his hiſtory is much inferior to that of Socrates.

Leo, ſurnamed the Great, was one of the moſt conſiderable writers, as well as actors, of his age. He was a native of Rome, and being deacon of the church under Celeſtinus, he urged Caſſian to write againſt Neſtorianiſm. A. D. 429, he was ſent to compromiſe a difference which had taken place between Aetius and Albinus, the Roman generals in Gaul; and in this abſence he was choſen biſhop of Rome, A. D. 440, at a time when the Pelagian, Neſtorian, and Eutychian controverſies were warmly agitated. All theſe ſects, as well as that of the Manichæans (many of whom fled to Rome from the perſecution of the Vandals in Africa) he oppoſed with the greateſt firmneſs.

A. D. 452, Leo was ſent by Valentinian to meet Attila, who was upon his march to invade Italy, and he prevailed upon him to return and ſettle beyond the Danube. He alſo

prevented the utter deſtruction of Rome, when it was taken by Genſeric, A. D. 455, and while he was intent upon compromiſing the differences of the church in the Eaſt, he died, A. D. 461. His zeal as a chriſtian biſhop would have been deſerving of the higheſt commendation, if it had not been accompanied with an equal deſire to extend the authority of his ſee, and had he not, on all occaſions, behaved with a haughtineſs unbecoming the proper epiſcopal character.

His writings conſiſt of *ſermons* and *epiſtles*, the former on very various ſubjects, and the latter on many of the important events of his time. The ſubjects of them all may be ſeen in Dupin*.

* Vol. iv. p. 81. &c.

A VIEW

A VIEW of the SUCCESSION of the ROMAN EMPERORS, and of the BISHOPS in the greater Sees to the Fall of the WESTERN EMPIRE.

EMPERORS.	*BISHOPS of ROME,*	*of JERUSALEM,*	*of ANTIOCH,*	*of ALEXANDRIA,*	*of CONSTANTINOPLE.*
14 Tiberius					
37 Caligula					
41 Claudius					
			42 Evodius		
54 Nero				Marc	
	67 Linus				
68 Galba			68 Ignatius		
69 Otho Vit. Vespasian					
	78 Anacletus				
79 Titus					
81 Domitian		Simeon			
	91 Clemens	Justus		Cerdon	
96 Nerva		Zacchæus			
98 Trajan		Tobia			
	100 Evaristus	Benjamin			
		John	107 Heros		
	108 Alexander	Matthias			
		Philip		110 Primus	
	116 Sixtus	Simeon			
117 Adrian		Justus II.			
		Levi		122 Justus	
	126 Telesphorus	Ephrem			
		Joseph	128 Cornelius		

The SUCCESSION of ROMAN EMPERORS and of BISHOPS.

EMPERORS.	*BISHOPS of ROME,*	*of JERUSALEM,*	*of ANTIOCH,*	*of ALEXANDRIA,*	*of CONSTANTINOPLE.*
		Judas		133 Eumenus	
		135 Marc			
	137 Hyginus				
138 Antoninus Pius					
	141 Pius				
			142 Heros II.		
				143 Marc II.	
				153 Celadion	
	157 Anicetus				
161 Marcus Aurelius					
				167 Agrippinus	
	168 Soter		168 Theophilus		
	177 Eleutherius				
				179 Julian	
180 Commodus					
			181 Maximin		
				189 Demetrius	
			190 Serapion		
	192 Victor				
193 Pertinax, &c.					
194 Severus					
	201 Zephyrinus				
211 Caracalla			211 Aſclepiades		
217 Macrinus					
218 Heliogabalus					
	219 Calixtus				
			220 Philetus		
222 Alexand. Severus					
	224 Urban				

The SUCCESSION of ROMAN EMPERORS and of BISHOPS.

EMPERORS.	*BISHOPS of ROME,*	*of JERUSALEM,*	*of ANTIOCH,*	*of ALEXANDRIA,*	*of CONSTANTINOPLE.*
			228 Zebinus		
	231 Pontianus			231 Heracleas	
235 Maximin	235 Anterus				
236 Gordian	236 Fabianus				
237 Max. Pupienus. Balbinus			237 Babylas		
244 Philip					
				248 Dionyſius	
249 Decius		Alexander			
			250 Fabius		
251 Gallus	251 Cornelius				
		252 Mazabenus			
	253 Lucius		253 Demetrianus		
254 Æmilian, Valerian, Gallienus					
	255 Stephen				
	257 Sixtus				
	259 Dionyſius				
		260 Hymenæus	260 Paulus Samoſat.		
				264 Maximus	
268 Claudius					
			269 Domnus		
270 Aurelian					
	271 Felix		271 Timæus		
275 Tacitus	275 Eutychianus				
276 Probus					
			281 Cyril		
282 Carus					
				283 Theonas	

The Succession of Roman Emperors and of Bishops.

EMPERORS.	*BISHOPS of ROME,*	*of JERUSALEM,*	*of ANTIOCH,*	*of ALEXANDRIA,*	*of CONSTANTINOPLE.*
284 Diocletian, &c.					
	296 Marcellinus				
		298 Zambdas			
				300 Peter	
		302 Hermon	302 Tyrannus		
	304 Marcellus				
306 Conſtantine					
	309 Euſebius				Metrophanes
	311 Melchiades			311 Achillas	
		312 Macarius		312 Alexander	
	312 Silveſter				313 Alexander
			315 Vitalis		
			319 Philogonus		
			323 Euſtathius		
				326 Athanaſius	
			329 Paulinus		
			330 Eulalius		
		331 Maximus III.			
			332 Euphronius		
	336 Marcus, Julius				336 Paulus
337 Conſtantius, Conſtans, Conſtantine Junior					
					341 Macedonius
			345 Stephen		
			348 Leontius		
		351 Cyril			351 Euſebius
	352 Liberius				

The SUCCESSION of ROMAN EMPERORS and of BISHOPS.

EMPERORS.	*BISHOPS of ROME, of JERUSALEM, of ANTIOCH, of ALEXANDRIA, of CONSTANTINOPLE.*			
		357 Eudoxius		360 Eudoxius
361 Julian				
363 Jovian				
364 Valentinian, Valens				
367 Gratian	367 Damasus			
			370 Evagrius	
			373 Peter II.	
375 Valentinian II.				
379 Theodosius				
				380 Gregory
		381 Flavianus	381 Timotheus	381 Nectarius
	385 Siricius		385 Theophilus	
		386 John II.		
		389 Evagrius		
		392 Flavianus		
395 Arcadius, Honorius				
				397 Chrysostom
	398 Anastasius			
	402 Innocent			
		404 Alexander		404 Arsacius
				405 Atticus
408 Theodosius II.				
			412 Cyril	
		416 Prailus		
	417 Zozimus			
	418 Boniface			
		419 Theodotus		
	423 Celestinus			
424 Valentinian III. W				
				426 Sisinnius

The SUCCESSION of ROMAN EMPERORS and of BISHOPS.

EMPERORS.	*BISHOPS of ROME,*	*of JERUSALEM,*	*of ANTIOCH,*	*of ALEXANDRIA,*	*of CONSTANTINOPLE.*
			427 John		
					428 Neſtorius
		429 Juvenal			
	431 Sixtus III.				431 Maximian
					434 Proclus
			436 Domnus		
	440 Leo				
				444 Dioſcorus	
					447 Flavian
					449 Anatolius
450 Marcian					
			451 Maximus		
				452 Proterus	
455 Maximus W					
			456 Baſil		
457 Leo				457 Timotheus Ælurus	
		458 Anaſtaſius	458 Acacius		458 Gennadius
			459 Martyrius		
				460 Timotheus Salofaciolus.	
461 Severus W	461 Hilary				
467 Anthimius W	467 Simplicius				
			471 Peter Fullo		471 Acacius
474 Leo, jun. Zeno					
475 Auguſtulus W					
		477 Martyrius			
				482 Peter Mongus	
					484 Flavitus
			486 Stephen II.		

W in this table, ſignifies emperor of the Weſt.

N. B. No notice is taken by the author from which this table is extracted of Euzoius the Arian biſhop of Antioch, in the time of Conſtantius and Valens, or of Melitius the Trinitarian biſhop, who had a church different from that of Paulinus, A. D. 329

THE INDEX.

N. B. The Roman numerals signify the *volume*, and the others the *page*. When the page is only noted, the first volume is to be understood, except the second is expressed before, in the same article.

A

ADRIAN, the emperor, favourable to the christians, 203.

Aetius, his history, ii. 156; condemned by Constantius, 180, dies, 414.

Agabus, a christian prophet, 70.

Agrippa, made king of the Jews, 61; persecutes the christians, 72; his death, 74.

——— the younger, made king of the Jews, 74; hears Paul, 127.

Alaric, invades Italy, ii. 460.

Alexander, Severus, favourable to the christians, 294.

———, bishop of Jerusalum, a martyr, 349.

———, ——— of Alexandria, opposes Arius, ii. 24.

Alexandria, a council held there in favour of Athanasius, ii. 122; an insurrection of the heathens there in the time of Theodosius, 395; disturbances there in the time of Cyril, 455.

Ambrose, made bishop of Milan, ii. 333; refuses the communion to Theodosius, 387; his writings, 488.

Ammonius, the master of Origen, his writings, 329.

Amphilochius, determines Theodosius in favour of the doctrine of the trinity, ii. 37.

Ananias and Sapphira, 39.

Anatolius, his writings, 408.

Anomæans, their rise, ii. 155.

Anthony, the monk, writes in favour of Athanasius, ii. 70.

Antioch, a council held there againſt Athanasius, ii. 122; the creed made there, 123; a second council held there, its creed, 132; a synod held there in the time of Jovian, 301; a schism there between Paulinus and Meletius, 282; an end put to it, 369; an insurrection there in the time of Theodosius, 386.

Antoninus Pius, favours the christians, 229.

Apelles, a Gnoſtic, 312.
Apollinaris, his hereſy, ii. 339; condemned at Alexandria, 284; at Conſtantinople, 376; his writings, and his ſon's, 253, 285, 363.
Apollonius, a Roman ſenator, ſuffers martyrdom, 289.
———, another, his writings, 324.
Apologies for chriſtianity, preſented to Marcus Aurelius, 234.
Apoſtolical Conſtitutions, ii. 365.
Aquila and *Priſcilla*, Paul meets with them, 98.
———, the Jewiſh writer, 281.
Arcadius, ſucceeds to the empire, ii. 435; dies, 454.
Arianiſm, the riſe of it, ii. 19; reflections on the progreſs of it, 187; received by the Northern nations, 193.
Arians, their hiſtory after the council of Nice, ii. 60; how divided in the time of Julian, 287; in the reign of Theodoſius, 412; at the acceſſion of Arcadius, 436; under Honorius, 468; their ſinging in the time of Chryſoſtom, 469; join the Trinitarians at Synnada in Phrygia, 470; Timotheus and George, eminent men among them, 471.
Ariminum, the council held there, ii. 164.
Ariſtides, his apology for chriſtianity, 205.
Arius, his friend, ii. 26; writes to Euſebius of Nicomedia, 29; baniſhed, 51; recalled, 62; dies, 74.
Arles, council there againſt the Donatiſts, ii. 17; againſt Athanaſius, 154.
Arnobius, his writings, ii. 206.
Arſacius, ſucceeds Chryſoſtom, ii. 451.
Athanaſius, at the council of Nice, ii. 45; choſen biſhop of Alexandria, 67; depoſed by the council of Tyre, 67; appeals to Conſtantine, 69; baniſhed, 70; returns, 121; baniſhed by the council of Antioch, 123; flies to Rome, 127; reſtored, 139; baniſhed again, and eſcapes with difficulty, 146; perſecuted by Julian, 230; holds a ſynod at Alexandria, 282; eſcapes from the perſecution of Julian, 286; favoured by Jovian, 299; withdraws from his ſee in the time of Valens, but invited by him to return, 316; his death, 319; his writings, 362.
Athenagoras, his writings, 235, 286.
Attila, ii. 540.
Audeans, ii. 77.
Auguſtulus, the laſt Roman emperor, ii. 542.
Aurelian, a perſecutor, 363.
Auſtin, oppoſes the Pelagians, ii. 280; his hiſtory and writings, 491.
Auxentius, the Arian biſhop of Milan, depoſed, ii. 333.

B.

Babylas, of Antioch, his body removed into the city, ii. 267.
Baptiſm, its primitive ſtate, 529.
Bardeſanes, his writings, 286.
Barnabas, ſent to Antioch, 69; the epiſtle that bears his name, 221.
Barſumas, a monk, favourer of Eutyches, ii. 516.
Bartholomew, his hiſtory, 142.
Baſil, his early hiſtory, ii. 324; his writings, 364.
Baſilicus, a favourer of Eutychianiſm, ii. 532.
Beryllus, the Unitarian, 320, 328.
Biſhops, the perſecution of them under Diocletian, 429; their primitive ſtate, 520.
Boniface, his martyrdom, 475.

Britain, Pelagianism introduced there, and expelled. ii. 487.

C.

Caius, a writer against the Unitarians, 318, 327.
Calama, the christians insulted by the heathens there, ii. 466.
Caligula, made emperor, 60.
Cassian, in France, ii. 485; his history and writings, 550.
Catechumens, 525.
Cerdon, the Gnostic, 218.
Cerinthus, a Jewish Gnostic, 216.
Cestius Gallus, the Roman governor, 160.
Chalcedon, the council held there against Eutyches, ii. 518.
Chrism, 530.
Christ, the first opinion of christians about him, 177.
Christianity, in what light it would appear to the Jews and Gentiles, 80.
Christian church, the constitution of it before the time of Constantine, 520.
Christians, leave Jerusalem at the siege by Titus, 164.
Chrysanthius, an eminent Novatian bishop, ii. 473; his writings, 497.
Chrysostom, his history, ii. 437; his quarrel with Severianus, 441; with the empress, 447, deposed, ib. restored, 448; provokes the empress again, 449; finally banished, 451; his death, 454; his writings, 497.
Church government, its primitive state, 189.
Churches, their ornaments in the time of Theodosius, ii. 429.
Claudius, made emperor, 72.
Clementine Homilies, 273.
Clemens, of *Alexadrina*, his writings, 325.
———, of *Rome*, his epistle, 221
Cælestis, or *Astarte*, her temple demolished, ii. 465.
Commodianus, a writer, 405.
Commodus, the Roman emperor, 288.
Confessors, who they were, 366.
Constantine, puts an end to the persecution of the christians, 448; revolutions in the empire, previous to the settlement of it under him, 489; his edicts in favour of christianity, ii. 2; his proceedings against the heathens, 5; his attempts to compose the Arian controversy, 34; favours the Arians, 62; his measures to suppress heresy, 77; circumstances attending his death, 89; of the sign of the cross seen by him in the heavens, 97; his writings, 209.
———, *Junior*, his religious principles, ii. 117; favours Athanasius, 120; dies, 121.
Constantinople, a council called there by Constantius, ii. 173; another by Theodosius, 372; another in favour of Chrysostom, 449.
Constantius, made emperor, ii. 113; his aversion to the Anomeans, 158; visits Rome, 161; his behaviour at the second council of Constantinople, 176; his death and character, 195.
Constans, his religious principles, ii. 117; favours Athanasius, 130; his death, 143.
Consubstantial, the term reprobated at the council of Antioch, 399; the meaning of it, ii. 75.
Cornelius, his conversion, 64.
Councils, their origin, 526; the great number of them in the time of Constantius, ii. 119; the first idea of the members of them being inspired, 530; the four œcumenical ones, observations concerning them, 533.

Creed, the word *filioque* added to it, ii. 410.
Cuſtoms, the great variety of them in the time of Theodoſius, ii. 419.
Cyprian, his martyrdom; 356, the oppoſition made to him, 370; his writings, 404.
Cyril of *Alexandria*, oppoſes Neſtorius, ii. 505; his triumph over him, 512; his writings, 547.
——, of *Jeruſalem*, his writings, ii. 363.

D.

Damaſus, a ſedition at Rome at his election, ii. 332, 356.
Daphne, a temple of Apollo there burned down, ii. 268.
Deacons, the ſeven appointed, 43; their office, 524.
Dead, the opinion of the ſtate of them in the time of Theodoſius, ii. 433.
Decius, the perſecution of chriſtians by him, 339.
Didymus of *Egypt*, an eminent trinitarian, ii. 321.
Diocletian, the perſecution of chriſtians by him, 410, 417; a ſtop put to it, 435; renewed, 439; ended by Conſtantine, 448; general reflections upon it, 495.
Diodorus of *Tarſus*, maſter of Theodorus of Mopſueſtia, ii. 437.
Dionyſius of *Alexandria*, his account of the perſecution by Decius, 341; his wonderful eſcape, 348; his ſufferings under Valerian, 355; his writings, 406.
Divination, of the heathens, to diſcover the ſucceſſor of Valens, ii. 343.
Doctrines, of the primitive church, 534.
Domitian, the perſecution of chriſtians by him, 194.
Donatiſts, their riſe, 507; Conſtantine's proceedings againſt them, ii. 14; in the reign of Conſtantius, ii. 202; in the reign of Julian, 234; of Valens, 354; hold a council at Carthage, 355; in the reign of Theodoſius, 417; of Honorius, 475.
Dorotheus, a martyr, 419.
Doxology, a new form of it introduced at Antioch, ii. 185.

E.

Eaſter, the controverſy concerning it, 306; ſettled at the council of Nice, ii. 51; how obſerved in primitive times, i. 533; different cuſtoms reſpecting it, ii. 419.
Ebionites, Euſebius's account of them, 313.
Edeſſa, Valens's cruelties there, ii. 319.
Egypt, the perſecution there under Diocletian, 421.
Elceſaites, 321.
Epheſus, council held there, ii. 507; a ſecond, 515.
Ephrem, the Syrian, his writings, ii. 363.
Epiphanius, takes a part againſt Chryſoſtom, ii. 455; his writings, 365.
Eunomians, leave the other Arians, ii. 191; change the form of baptiſm, 341; divided among themſelves, 412.
Eunomius, brought from Egypt by Aetius, ii. 178; made biſhop of Cyzicum, 180; leaves Cyzicum, 191, 310; his hiſtory in the reign of Theodoſius, 412.
Euſebius of *Cæſarea*, his conduct at the council of Nice, ii. 50; dies, 121; his writings, 207.
—— of *Emeſa*, his hiſtory, ii. 124.

Euſebius of *Nicomedia*, favours Arius, ii. 31; baniſhed by Conſtantine, 60; recalled, 64; dies, 128.
Euſtathius, of *Antioch*, depoſed by the Arians, ii. 65.
———, of *Sebaſte*, his ſeverity condemned, ii. 205.
Eutyches, who, ii. 514; his hiſtory after the council of Chalcedon, ii. 525.
Eutychianiſm, its riſe, ii. 514; its prevalence, 527; its hiſtory ſubſequent to the acceſſion of Leo, 529; its reception at Antioch and Alexandria, 530.
Eutychius, an Eunomian, and founder of a new ſect, ii. 416.

F.

Fabian, biſhop of Rome, his martyrdom, 349.
Faſts, in the primitive church, 532.
Feliciſſimus, his oppoſition to Cyprian, 370.
Felix, examines Paul, 125.
——, a martyr in Africa, 426.
Feſtivals, in the primitive church, 533.
———, *heathen*, converted into chriſtian ones, ii. 431.
Feſtus, hears Paul, 126.
Flavianus, biſhop of Conſtantinople, ii. 515; his death, 517.
———, and *Diodorus*, zealous trinitarians at Antioch, ii. 186.
Florus, the Roman Governor of Judea, 158.
Fullo, Peter, a favourer of Eutychianiſm, ii. 530; made biſhop of Antioch, 532.

G.

Gallienus, a friend to the chriſtians, 360; calamities of the empire under him, 362.
Gallus, nephew of Conſtantius, put to death, ii. 154.
Gamaliel, his advice, 42.
George, of *Cappadocia*, made biſhop of Alexandria, ii. 127; murdered, 226.
Gibbon, Mr. his obſervations on the converſion of Conſtantine cenſured, ii. 105; his account of the perſecution of Athanaſius, 147.
Gildon, favours the Donatiſts, ii. 476.
Gnoſtics, their firſt appearance, 180; their principles, 182; in the reign of Adrian, 211; afterwards, 311.
Goths, many of them converted to chriſtianity in the time of Valens, ii. 343.
Gratian, his death, ii. 383.
Gregory of *Nazianzum*, his hiſtory, ii. 324; his writings, 364.
———, of *Neocæſarea*, his writings, ii. 406.
———, of *Niſſa*, his writings, ii. 364.

H.

Heatheniſm, the nature of it, 3; obſervations on the ſtate of it in the reign of Julian, ii. 210; after his death, 289; in the reign of Theodoſius, 394, 401; his endeavours to ſuppreſs it, 403; in the time of Honorius, 463; extirminated by the Vandals in Africa, 544.
Hegeſippus, his account of the Gnoſtics, 217; his writings, 281.
Heretics, the controverſy about re-baptizing them, 374.
Hermas, his ſhepherd, 222.
Hierax, his writings, ii. 208.
Hilary, baniſhed by Conſtantius, ii. 161; attends the council of Seleucia, 173; his writings, ii. 363.
Hippolytus, his writings, 327.
Holy Spirit, decreed to be conſubſtantial with the Father and Son, ii. 282, 375; a controverſy about it, 337.

Homoiouſians, ii. 184; apply to the biſhop of Rome, ii. 313.
Honorius, the political events of his reign, ii. 460; after his death, 535.
Hoſius of *Corduba*, ſent to Egypt by Conſtantine, ii. 34; kept from his ſee by Conſtantius, ii. 161; dies, 163.
Hypatia, murdered by the friends of Cyril, ii. 458.
Hypoſtaſis, the uſe of that term diſcuſſed at a council in Alexandria, ii. 284.

I.

Ignatius, his martyrdom, 202; his epiſtles, 223.
Illyricum, a council held there in the time of Valens, ii. 335; claimed by the biſhop of Rome, 544.
Indians, not trinitarians, ii. 193.
Innocent, biſhop of Rome, takes the part of Chryſoſtom, ii. 452.
Irenæus, his writings, 286.

J.

James, the apoſtle, his hiſtory, 137
Jerom, his hiſtory and writings, ii. 489.
Jeruſalem, the council of the apoſtles there, 85; taken by Titus, 170.
Jeſus, a brief account of his hiſtory, 9, &c.
——, the ſon of Ananus, 157.
Jews, their religion at the coming of Chriſt, 5; their calamities and diſperſion by Titus, 150; revolt under Trajan, 208; under Adrian, 209; their ſubſequent hiſtory, 276; how treated by the ſons of Conſtantine, ii. 115; their quarrel with Cyril of Alexandria, 455.
——, ſuffer at Immeſtar, ii. 459.
John, the *apoſtle*, his writings, 143, 220; his ſufferings under Domitian, 196; his death, 198.
John, the *Baptiſt*, his commiſſion, 7.
——, *biſhop of Antioch*, at the council of Epheſus, ii. 509.
Joſephus, commands againſt Veſpaſian, 162; his writings, 225.
Jovian, his reign, ii. 289; addreſſed by the different ſects of chriſtians, 300; his prudent anſwers to them, 303; his death, 305.
Judas, his writings, 326.
Jude, the apoſtle, his epiſtle, 141.
Julian, his acceſſion to the empire, ii. 210; his ſuperſtition, 216; his prejudice againſt chriſtianity, 226; his behaviour to Athanaſius, 230; his artifice to ſubvert chriſtianity, 233; his letter to Arſacius, high-prieſt of Galatia, 235; his more direct attempts to extirpate chriſtianity, 242; to make his army chriſtian, 248; forbids the chriſtians to teach the heathen writings, 251; violences committed upon chriſtians in his reign, 255; favours the Jews, 262; marches againſt the Perſians, 264; his behaviour at Antioch, 265; the ſtory of his ſuppoſed human ſacrifice at Carrhæ, 273; his death, 272; calamities of the empire in his reign, 276; his character, 277; eccleſiaſtical events of his reign, 281; his writings againſt chriſtianity, 297.
——, *Count of the Eaſt* dies, ii. 269.
Julianus, a martyr, 344.
Julius Africanus, his writings, 328.
Juſtin Martyr, his apology, 234; his martyrdom, 241; his writings, 282.

Juſtina, wife of Valentinian, favours the Arians, ii. 384.
Juvenalis, biſhop of Jeruſalem, diſturbed by the Eutychians, ii. 525.

L.

Lactantius, his writings, ii. 206.
Lampſacum, an Arian council held there in the time of Valens, ii. 308.
Laodicea, the council held there, ii. 359.
Laurence, a martyr, 359.
Lent, different rules concerning it, ii. 419.
Leo, biſhop of Rome, advances the dignity of his ſee, ii. 444; oppoſes the Eutychians, 516, 519, 545; his arrogance, 522. his writings, 551.
—, the *Thracian*, ſucceeds Marcian, ii. 529.
Leonidas, the father of Origen, beheaded, 291.
Libanius, his encomium on Julian, ii. 297.
Liberius, biſhop of Rome, his treatment of Athanaſius, ii. 153; baniſhed by Conſtantius, 160; ſubmits to the emperor, and declares againſt Athanaſius, 163.
Licinius, revives, the perſecution of the chriſtians, 450.
Lord's Supper, primitive method of adminiſtering it, 531.
Lucifer, of *Cagliari*, in Egypt, ii. 281; goes to Antioch, 282.
Luke, his goſpel, 144.
Lyons, and Vienne in Gaul, martyrs there, 244.

M.

Macarii, their writings, ii. 362.
Macedonius, made biſhop of Conſtantinople, ii. 130; perſecutes the trinitarians, 148, 149; depoſed, 175.
Malta, Paul ſhipwrecked there, 129.
Manichæans, an account of them, 513.
Marcellus of *Ancyra*, depoſed by the Arians, ii. 72; reſtored, 138.
———, of *Apamea*, murdered by the heathens, ii. 397.
Marcian, made emperor, ii. 517.
———, the Gnoſtic, 218.
Marcus Aurelius, perſecutes the chriſtians, 232.
Maris, biſhop of Chalcedon, Julian's behaviour to him, ii. 245.
Mark, his goſpel, 144.
Martyrdom, reflections upon it, 469.
Martyrs, reſpect paid to them, 365.
Mary, the *Virgin*, honours paid to her, ii. 513.
Maſſada, taken, 172.
Matthew, his goſpel, 143.
Maximian, his reſcript putting a ſtop to the perſecution, 436.
Maximianiſts, a ſect of Donatiſts, ii. 417.
Maximilian, a martyr in Africa, 425.
Maximin, perſecutes the chriſtians, 295, 499; his reſcript to the people of Tyre, 441; dies, 450.
———, declares himſelf *emperor* in Britain, ii. 376.
Maximus, a ſoldier and martyr, 360.
———, the *philoſopher*, how received by Julian, ii. 220; his death, 346.
Meletians, their riſe, 506; how treated at the council of Nice, ii. 53; reſtored to the favour of Conſtantine, 64.
Melito, his writings, 235, 284.
Milan, the council there under Conſtantius, ii. 159.
Millenium, the controverſy concerning it, 401.
Minutius Felix, his writings, 337.
——— *Fundanus*, Adrian's reſcript addreſſed to him, 206.

Monks, their origin, 380; in the reign of Conſtantius, ii. 204; their orthodoxy, 342; of Egypt, perſecuted by Valens, 320; their anthropomorphitiſm, and diſlike of Origen, 442.
Montaniſm, 253.
Muſanus, his writings, 285.

N.

Nectarius, changes the diſcipline of the church of Conſtantinople, ii. 426.
Nepos, a Millenarian, 401.
Nero, perſecutes the chriſtians, 145.
Neſtorianiſm, ii. 499.
Neſtorius, his hiſtory, ii. 501; his baniſhment and death, 511.
Nicolaitans, 216.
Nice, the council held there, ii. 39.
——, in Thrace, a council held there, ii. 168.
Nicene creed, ii. 46.
——— *faith*, where held in the time of Valens, ii. 321.
Noetus, an Unitarian, 393.
Novatians, how treated at the council of Nice, ii. 54; in the time of Valens, 352; their diviſions in the time of Theodoſius, 416; in the time of Arcadius, 472; ſuffer at Alexandria, ib. at Rome, 474.
Novatianiſm, the riſe of it, 369.
Novatus, of *Africa*, 370.
———, of *Rome*, 369; his writings, 405.

O.

Oracles, encourage Julian to march againſt the Perſians, ii. 270.
Origen, his hiſtory and writings, 330; his ſufferings under Decius, 350; ſome of his diſciples martyrs, 291.
Origeniſts, their riſe, ii. 443.
Oroſius, his hiſtory and writings, ii. 548.

P.

Pagans, origin of the name, ii. 12
Paleſtine, martyrs there in the time of Diocletian, 452.
Pamphilus, his martyrdom, 464.
Pantænus, his writings, 325.
Paphnutius, his behaviour at the council of Nice, ii. 52.
Papias, his writings, 223.
Parmenian, a celebrated Donatiſt, ii. 355, 417.
Patripaſſians, 270.
Paul, the apoſtle, his firſt appearance, 45; his converſion, 54; preaches in Arabia, 58; his trance, 75; his firſt apoſtolical journey, 76; his ſecond, 86; paſſes into Greece, 90; at Athens, 95; at Corinth, 101; writes to the Theſſalonians, 101; to the Galatians, 102; his third journey, 105; at Epheſus, 106; writes to the Corinthians, 108; to Timothy, 111; to Titus, 112; the ſecond epiſtle to the Corinthians, 113; to the Romans, 113; at Troas, 116; arrives for the laſt time at Jeruſalem, 118; apprehended there, 120; ſent to Rome, 128; writes to the Epheſians, Phillippians, Colloſians, and the ſecond epiſtle to Timothy, 131; to Philemon, 135; to the Hebrews, 135; his death, 137.
——, *the firſt hermit*, 389.
——, *biſhop of Conſtantinople*, ii. 122, baniſhed, 128; dies, 145.
——, *of Samoſata*, the Unitarian, 396.
Paulinus, his writings, ii. 493.
Pelagian controverſy, the hiſtory of it, ii. 478.
Pelagians, the oppoſers of them in Gaul, ii. 488.
Penitents, their treatment, difference of opinion on the ſubject, 364.

Pentecoſt, the gift of tongues on it, 30; obſerved by chriſtians, 533.
Peter the apoſtle, his curing a lame man, 35; impriſoned, 41; raiſes Dorcas to life, 63; releaſed from priſon by an angel, 73; temporizes at Antioch, 83; his farther hiſtory, 139; his epiſtles, 140; his death, 139.
Perſia, a perſecution of the chriſtians in it, ii. 197.
Petilian, a learned Donatiſt, ii. 476.
Perpetua, and Felicitas, their martyrdom, 298.
Phileas, his epiſtle concerning the perſecution by Diocletian, 423.
Philip, the *apoſtle*, his hiſtory, 142.
——, the *deacon*, preaches in Samaria, &c. 48.
——, of *Crete*, his writings, 224.
Philoſophers, heathen, their conduct in the perſecution of chriſtians, 432; how received by Julian, ii. 220.
Photinus, the Unitarian biſhop of Sirmium, ii. 131; his behaviour at and after his condemnation, 150.
Phrygia, the perſecution there under Diocletian, 427.
Pierius, his writings, 409.
Pilate, his memoirs fictitious, 440.
Plague, in the time of Gallus, 353.
Plato, his three principles, 264.
Pliny, the *younger*, his letter to Trajan, 199.
Polycarp, his epiſtle, 223; his martyrdom, 337.
Pontus, the perſecution there under Diocletian, 428.
Preſbyters, in the primitive church, 523.
——, *penetentiary*, aboliſhed in the church of Conſtantinople, ii. 426.
Priſcillianiſts, their hiſtory, ii. 405.
Procopius, rebels againſt Valens and is defeated, ii. 308, &c.
Proterius, made biſhop of Alexandria, ii. 524; murdered, 528.
Public worſhip, in the primitive church, 527.
Pulcheria, ſiſter of Theodoſius II. prepoſſeſſed againſt Neſtorius, ii. 510.

Q.

Quadratus, his apology for chriſtianity, 205.

R.

Relics, a law of Theodoſius about them, ii. 432.
Revelation, the book of, 220.
Rhadagaiſus, his defeat, ii. 460, 464.
Rhodon, his writings, 287.
Rites, what firſt uſed by chriſtians, 187.
Rogatians, a ſect of Donatiſts, ii. 418.
Rome, the luxury of its biſhops in the time of Valens, ii. 358.
Ruffinus, his hiſtory and writings, ii. 491.

S.

Sabellius, an unitarian, 394.
Sapor, king of Perſia, Conſtantine's letter to him in favour of the chriſtians, ii. 12.
Saracens, many of them embrace chriſtianity, ii. 343.
Sardica, the council there, ii. 135.
Seleucia, a council held there, ii. 170.
Semipelagianiſm, ii. 485.
Serapion, of Antioch, his writings, 326.
——, of *Egypt*, ſhrunk from perſecution and repented, 351.
Sergius Paulus, converted by Paul, 76.
Severus, a perſecutor of chriſtians, 289.
Sibylline verſes, 287.
Sicarii, among the Jews, 156.

Simeon, biſhop of Jeruſalem, a martyr, 201.
——— *Stylites*, ii. 530.
Simon Magus, 49, 51.
Singing, a new method of it introduced at Antioch, ii. 186.
Sirmium, the council held there to depoſe Photinus, ii. 149, a ſecond council held there, 162.
Siſinnius, an eminent Novatian biſhop, ill treated by Chryſoſtom, ii. 439.
Sixtus, biſhop of Rome, a martyr, 359.
Socrates Scholaſticus, his writings, ii. 550.
Sophia Sancta, a church at Conſtantinople, dedicated, ii. 130.
Sozomen Hermias, his writings, ii. 550.
Stephen, the deacon, his death, 47.
Stilicho, his hiſtory, ii. 461.
Sulpicius Severus, his writings, ii. 497.
Superſtition, the ſtate of it in the time of Tertullian, 321.
Symmachus, the Ebionite, 281.
———, *the heathen*, pleads for his religion, ii. 398.
Syneſius, his writings, ii. 498.

T.

Tarachus, and his companions, martyrs, 479.
Tatian, his writings, 285.
Temple, at Jeruſalem, deſtroyed, 170.
Tertullian, his writings, 328.
Themiſtius, his commendation of Jovian, ii. 302; pleads for univerſal toleration, 322.
Theodoret, anſwers Cyril, ii. 506; his writings, 548.
Theodorus, of Mopſueſtia, the maſter of Neſtorius, ii. 437.
Theodoſius, made emperor, ii. 366; his endeavours to ſupport the catholic faith, 379; his ſeverity to the people at Antioch, 385; at Theſſalonica, 387; his uſeful regulations, 388; his death and character, 390.
Theodoſius II. takes the part of Neſtorius, ii. 510; dies, 517.
———, a *biſhop of Jeruſalem*, made by the Eutychians, ii. 525.
Theodotion, the Ebionite, 281.
Theognoſtus, his writings, 408.
Theophilus, of *Antioch*, his writings, 284.
———, of *Cæſarea*, his writings, 324.
———, of *Alexandria*, his quarrel with the monks of Egypt, ii. 442; with Chryſoſtom, 445.
Theophronius, the ſucceſſor of Eunomius, ii. 415.
Tiberius, the emperor dies, 60.
Timotheus Ælurus, made biſhop of Alexandria, ii. 528.
Titus, converted by Paul, 71.
—— *the emperor*, lays ſiege to Jeruſalem, 164.
Titus, of *Boſtra*, unjuſtly treated by Julian, ii. 231.
Traditors, who, 508.
Trajan, perſecutes the chriſtians, 198.
Trinity, origin of the doctrine, 363; carried to its proper extent, ii. 327.
Triſagion, ii. 531.

U.

Unitarianiſm, the ſtate of it in the time of Origen and afterwards, 390; in the time of Valens, ii. 350; of Theodoſius, 412.
Unitarians, in the third century, 313; how treated at the council of Nice, ii. 56.
Urſacius, and Valens, chiefs among the Arians, ii. 128; recant, ii. 142; their management at the council of Ariminum, 166.

Valens,

V

Valens, made emperor, ii. 306; a violent Arian, 307, 349; perſecutes all but the Anomæans, 312; his cruelty, 317; his death, 347.

——, *biſhop of Murſa*, his behaviour at the battle fought near that place, ii. 144.

Valentinian, baniſhed by Julian, ii. 247; made emperor, 306; events of his reign, 332; his death, 336.

Valentinian II. ſucceeds to the empire, ii. 367; put to death, 385; his death revenged by Theodoſius, ibid.

——— III. ſucceeds to the empire, ii. 463; his law in favour of the biſhop of Rome, 545; his death, 540.

Valentinus, the Gnoſtic, 219.

Valerian, a perſecutor of the chriſtians, 354.

Vandals, Arians, and perſecutors of the Manichæans, ii. 543.

ADDITION.

AS I have given much at large the evidence of the primitive chriſtian church having been Unitarian, in my *Hiſtory of Early Opinions concerning Chriſt*, I did not intend, in this work, to do any thing more than refer to *that* for the proof of every thing relating to that ſubject; but having quoted a few paſſages from the early chriſtian writers, as my authorities for ſome of the articles, it may not be amiſs to add a few in ſupport of what is advanced, Vol. I. p. 315, of its having been acknowledged by the early trinitarian writers, that the doctrines of the pre-exiſtence and divinity of Chriſt, were not taught with clearneſs and effect, before the publication of John's Goſpel; and a very few will ſuffice for my preſent purpoſe. Thoſe to whom they may not give ſatisfaction will find what cannot fail to give it in the large work from which theſe are extracted.

"John

"John alone," says Origen*, "introduced the know-
"ledge of the eternity of Christ, to the minds of the
"Fathers."

Eusebius says †, "John began the doctrine of the
"divinity of Christ, that being reserved for him, as the
"most worthy."

Chrysostom writes the most copiously on this subject; but I shall content myself with a very few passages from him. He says ‡, "John alone taught the eternal
"and supercelestial wisdom. John ‖, first lighted up
"the lamp of Theology, and all the most distant
"churches, running to it, lighted up their lamps, and
"returned rejoicing, saying *In the beginning was the logos.*" He represents §, all the preceding writers of the New Testament as "children, who heard, but did not understand
"things, and who were busy about childish sports. But John", he says, "taught what the angels themselves did
"not know before he declared it." Of the three first evangelists, he says ¶, "they all treated of the fleshly
"dispensation, and silently, by the miracles of Christ,
"indicated his dignity. The dignity of the logos of
"God was hid, the arrows against the heretics were con-
"cealed, and the fortification to defend the right faith
"was not raised. John therefore, the son of thunder, be-
"ing the last, advanced to the doctrine of the divinity
"of Christ."

* Opera, Vol. ii. p. 428. † Hist. Lib. iii. Cap. 24. p. 117.
Johan. I. Opera, Vol vi. p. 253. ‖ Ibid. p. 604.
Opera, Vol. viii. p. 2. ¶ De Sigillis, Opera, Vol. vi. p. 173.

A CATA-

A

CATALOGUE of BOOKS,

WRITTEN BY

Dr. PRIESTLEY,

AND PRINTED FOR

J. JOHNSON, Bookſeller, No. 72, St. Paul's Church Yard, *London*.

1. THE Hiſtory and Preſent State of ELECTRICITY, with original Experiments, illuſtrated with Copper-plates, 4th Edition, corrected and enlarged, 4to. 1l. 1s.

2. A Familiar INTRODUCTION to the STUDY of ELECTRICITY, 5th Edition, 8vo. 2s. 6d.

3. The Hiſtory and Preſent State of Diſcoveries relating to VISION, LIGHT, and COLOURS, 2 vols, 4to. illuſtrated with a great Number of Copper-plates, 1l. 11s. 6d. in boards, 1l. 18s. bound.

4. A Familiar Introduction to the Theory and Practice of PERSPECTIVE, with Copper-plates, 2d Edition, 5s. in boards, 6s. bound.

5. OBSERVATIONS and EXPERIMENTS, relating to different kinds of Air, and other Branches of Natural Philoſophy, connected with the Subject. 3 vols. 8vo. being the former ſix volumes, arranged and abridged.

6. A NEW CHART of HISTORY, containing a View of the principal Revolutions of Empire that have taken Place in the World; with a Book deſcribing it, containing an Epitome of Univerſal Hiſtory, 4th Edition, 10s. 6d.

7. A CHART of BIOGRAPHY, with a Book containing an Explanation of it, and a Catalogue of all the Names inſerted in it, 6th Edition, very much improved, 10s. 6d.

8. LECTURES on Hiſtory and GENERAL POLICY; to which is prefixed, an Eſſay on a Courſe of Liberal Education, for Civil and Active Life, 8vo. in boards 1l. 1s.

N. B.

N. B. *These Charts mounted on Canvas and Rollers, to be hung up in a Study, &c. are* 14*s. each.*

9. The RUDIMENTS of ENGLISH GRAMMAR, adopted to the Uſe of Schools, 1s. 6d. bound.

The above GRAMMAR, with Notes and Obſervations, for the Uſe of thoſe who have made ſome Proficiency in the Language. The 4th Edition, 3s. bound.

10. OBSERVATIONS relating to EDUCATION: more eſpecially as it reſpects the Mind. To which is added, An Eſſay on a Courſe of Liberal Education for Civil and Active Life, 2d Edition, 3s. 6d. in boards.

11. A COURSE of LECTURES on ORATORY and CRITICISM, 4to. 10s. 6d. in boards, 14s. bound.

12. An Eſſay on the firſt Principles of Government, and on the Nature of Political, Civil, and Religious LIBERTY, 2d. Edition, much enlarged, 4s. in boards, 5s. bound. *In this Edition are introduced the* Remarks on Church Authority, in Anſwer to Dr. Balguy, *formerly publiſhed ſeparately.*

13. An Examination of Dr. REID's Inquiry into the Human Mind, on the Principles of Common Senſe, Dr. BEATTIE's Eſſay on the Nature and Immutability of Truth, and Dr. OSWALD's Appeal to Common Senſe, in Behalf of Religion, 2d. Edit. 5s. in boards, 6s. bound.

14. HARTLEY's THEORY of the HUMAN MIND, on the Principle of the Aſſociation of Ideas, with Eſſays relating to the Subject of it, 8vo. 5s. in boards, 6s. bound.

15. DISQUISITIONS relating to MATTER and SPIRIT. To which is added, the Hiſtory of the Philoſophical Doctrine concerning the Origin of the Soul, and the Nature of Matter; with its Influence on Chriſtianity, eſpecially with reſpect to the Doctrine of the Pre-exiſtence of Chriſt. Alſo the Doctrine of Philoſophical Neceſſity illuſtrated, the 2d. Edition enlarged and improved, with Remarks on thoſe who have controverted the Principles of them, 2 vols. 8s. 6d. in boards, 10s. bound.

16. A FREE DISCUSSION of the DOCTRINES of MATERIALISM and PHILOSOPHICAL NECESSITY, in a Correſpondence between Dr. PRICE and Dr. PRIESTLEY. To which are added by Dr. PRIESTLEY, an INTRODUCTION, explaining the Nature of the Controverſy, and Letters to ſeveral Writers who have animadverted

verted on his Diſquiſitions relating to Matter and Spirit, or his Treatiſe on Neceſſity, 8vo. 6s. ſewed, 7s. bound.

17. A Defence of the Doctrine of NECESSITY, in two Letters to the Rev. Mr. John Palmer, 2s.

18. A Letter to JACOB BRYANT, Eſq; in Defence of Philoſophical Neceſſity, 1s.

The two preceding Articles may be properly bound up with the ſecond volume of Diſquiſitions on Matter and Spirit.

19. LETTERS to a PHILOSOPHICAL UNBELIEVER, Part I. Containing an Examination of the principal Objections to the Doctrines of *Natural Religion*, and eſpecially thoſe contained in the Writings of Mr. Hume, 3s. ſewed.

20. ADDITIONAL LETTERS to a PHILOSOPHICAL UNBELIEVER in Anſwer to Mr. WILLIAM HAMMON, 1s. 6d.

21. LETTERS to a PHILOSOPHICAL UNBELIEVER, Part II. Containing a State of the Evidence of Revealed Religion, with Animadverſions on the two laſt Chapters of the firſt Volume of *Mr. Gibbon's Hiſtory of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, 3s.

N. B. *The two proceding Parts, bound together*, 7s. 6d.

22. A HARMONY of the EVANGELISTS in Greek. To which are prefixed, CRITICAL DISSERTATIONS in Engliſh, 4to. 14s. in boards, 17s. bound.

23. A HARMONY of the EVANGELIST in *Engliſh*, with Notes, and an occaſional Paraphraſe for the Uſe of the Unlearned. To which are prefixed, Critical Diſſertations, and a Letter to the Biſhop of Oſſory, 4to. 12s. in boards, 15s. bound.

N. B. *Thoſe who are poſſeſſed of the* Greek Harmony, *may have this in* Engliſh *without the* Critical Diſſertations, 8s. in boards.

*** The Greek and Engliſh Harmony with the Critical Diſſertations, *complete* 1l. 1s. in boards, or 1l. 4s. bound.

24. INSTITUTES of NATURAL and REVEALED RELIGION, in two Volumes, 8vo. 2d. edition, 10s. 6d. in boards, 12s. bound.

N. B. *The third Part of this Work, containing the* Doctrines of Revelation, *may be had alone, 2s. 6d. ſewed.*

25. An HISTORY of the CORRUPTIONS of CHRISTIANITY, with a general Concluſion, in two Parts. Part I. Containing Conſiderations addreſſed to Unbelievers, and eſpecially to Mr. GIBBON. Part II. Containing Conſiderations addreſſed to the Advocates for the preſent Eſtabliſhment, and eſpecially to Biſhop HURD, 2 vols. 8vo. 12s. in boards, or 14s. bound. Or,

bound

bound uniformly with the three following DEFENCES *of it, in* 3 *vols.* 1l. 10s.

26. A REPLY to the ANIMADVERSIONS on the HISTORY of the CORRUPTIONS of CHRISTIANITY, in the Monthly Review for June, 1783; with Obſervations relating to the Doctrine of the Primitive Church, concerning the Perſon of CHRIST, 8vo. 1s.

27. REMARKS on the MONTHLY REVIEW of the LETTERS to Dr. HORSLEY; in which the REV. Mr. SAMUEL BADCOCK, the writer of that Review, is called upon to defend what he has advanced in it, 6d.

28. LETTERS to Dr. HORSLEY, Archdeacon of St. Albans, in three Parts, containing farther Evidence that the Primitive Chriſtian Church was Unitarian, 7s. 6d.

N. B. *Theſe laſt three Articles together in boards.* 9s. *or* 10s. *bound.*

29. An HISTORY of EARLY OPINIONS concerning JESUS CHRIST, compiled from Original Writers; proving that the Chriſtian Church was at firſt Unitarian, 4 vols. octavo, 1l. 4s. in boards, or 1l. 8s. bound.

30. A VIEW of the PRINCIPLES and CONDUCT of the PROTESTANT DISSENTERS, with Reſpect to the Civil and Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitution of England, 2d edition, 1s. 6d.

31. A FREE ADDRESS to PROTESTANT DISSENTERS, on the Subject of the Lord's Supper, 3d Edition, with Additions, 2s.--
N. B. The Additions to be had alone, 1s.

32. An ADDRESS to PROTESTANT DISSENTERS, on the ſubject of giving the Lord's Supper to Children, 1s.

33. A FREE ADDRESS to PROTESTANT DISSENTERS, on the Subject of CHURCH DISCIPLINE; with a preliminary Diſcourſe concerning the Spirit of Chriſtianity, and the Corruptions of it by falſe Notions of Religion, 2s. 6d.

34. LETTERS to the Authors of *Remarks on ſeveral late Publications relative to the Diſſenters, in a letter to Dr. Prieſtley,* 1s.

35. A LETTER to a LAYMAN, on the Subject of Mr. Lindſey's Propoſal for a reformed Engliſh Church, on the Plan of the late Dr. Samuel Clark, 6d.

36. THREE LETTERS to Dr. Newcome, Biſhop of Waterford, on the Duration of our Saviour's Miniſtry, 3s. 6d.

37. LETTERS to the Jews; inviting them to an amicable Diſcuſion of the evidence of Chriſtianity, in two parts, 2s.

N. B. *The preceding* eight Tracts, No. 28 to 35, *incluſive, may be had in* 2 *vols. boards* 14s. *by giving orders for* Dr. Prieſtley's large tracts.

38. DEFENCES of UNITARIANISM for the Year 1786; containing Letters to Dr. Horne, Dean of Canterbury; to the Young Men, who are in a Courſe of Education for the Chriſtian Miniſtry, at the Univerſities of Oxford and Cambridge; to Dr. Price; and to Mr. Parkhurſt; on the Subject of the Perſon of Chriſt, ſecond edition, 3s.

39. DEFENCES of UNITARIANISM for the Year 1787; containing Letters to the Rev. Dr. Geddes, to the Rev. Dr. Price, Part II. and to the Candidates for Orders in the Two Univerſities. Part II. Relating to Mr. Howe's Appendix to his fourth Volume of Obſervations on Books, a Letter by an Under-Graduate of Oxford, Dr. Croft's Bampton Lectures, and ſeveral other Publications, 2s. 6d.

40. DEFENCES of UNITARIANISM for the Years 1788 and 1789; containing Letters to the Biſhop of St. Davids, to the Rev. Mr. Barnard, the Rev. Dr. Knowles, and the Rev. Mr. Hawkins, 3s. 6d.

41. DISCOURSES on VARIOUS SUBJECTS, including ſeveral on PARTICULAR OCCASIONS, 6s. in boards.

42. A CATECHISM for *Children and Young Perſons*, 5th Edit. 4d.

43. A SCRIPTURE CATECHISM, conſiſting of a Series of Queſtions; with References to the Scriptures, inſtead of Anſwers, 2d. Edition, 3d.

44. Dr. Watts's Hiſtorical Catechiſm, with Alterations, 6d.

45. An APPEAL to the ſerious and candid Profeſſors of Chriſtianity, on the following ſubjects, viz. 1. The Uſe of Reaſon in Matters of Religion. 2. The Power of Man to do the Will of God. 3. Original Sin. 4. Election and Reprobation. 5. The Divinity of Chriſt; and 6. Attonement for Sin by the Death of Chriſt, a new Edition; to which is added, a Conciſe Hiſtory of thoſe Doctrines, 2d. An Edition in large Print, 6d.

46. A Familiar Illuſtration of certain paſſages of Scripture, relating to the ſame Subjects, the 2d. Edition 6d.

47. CONSIDERATIONS for the Uſe of Young Men, and the Parents of Young Men. 2d Edition, 2d.

48. A SERIOUS ADDRESS to Maſters of Families, with Forms of Family Prayer, 2d. Edit. 9d.

BOOKS *written by* Dr. PRIESTLEY.

49. A Free Addreſs to Proteſtant Diſſenters as ſuch. By a Diſſenter. A new Edition, enlarged and corrected, 1s. 6d. An Allowance is made to thoſe who buy this Pamphlet to give away.

50. The TRIUMPH of TRUTH; being an Account of the Trial of Mr. ELWALL, for Hereſy and Blaſphemy, at Stafford Aſſizes, before Judge Denton, 2d Edition, 2d.

51. A FREE ADDRESS to thoſe who have petitioned for the Repeal of the late Act of Parliament in favour of the ROMAN CATHOLICS, 2d. or 12s. per Hundred to give away.

52. A GENERAL VIEW of the Arguments for the UNITY of GOD, and againſt the Divinity and Pre-exiſtence of Chriſt, from Reaſon, from the Scriptures, and from Hiſtory, 2d Edition, 2d.

N. B. The laſt Eleven Tracts *may be had together, in boards*, 4s. 6d. *by giving Orders for* Dr. Prieſtley's ſmaller Tracts.

53. A LETTER to the Right Honourable WILLIAM PITT, Firſt Lord of the Treaſury, and Chancellor of the Exchequer; on the Subject of TOLERATION and CHURCH ESTABLISHMENTS; occaſioned by his SPEECH againſt the Repeal of the TEST and CORPORATION ACTS, on Wedneſday the 21ſt of March, 1787, the ſecond Edition, 1s.

54. A SERMON preached before the Congregations of the OLD and NEW MEETINGS, at Birmingham, November 5, 1789, recommending the Conduct to be obſerved by Diſſenters in order to procure the Repeal of the Corporations and Teſt Acts, 6d.

Alſo Publiſhed under the Direction of Dr. PRIESTLEY.

THE THEOLOGICAL REPOSITORY,

Conſiſting of Original Eſſays, Hints, Queries, &c. calculated to promote Religious Knowledge, in ſix Volumes, 8vo. Price 1l. 16s. in boards, or 2l. 2s. bound.

ERRATA.

N. B. (*b*) Signifies, *from the Bottom of the Page.*

Page 48, line 4, for ανασχ, read αναρχ.
—— 72, line 3, (*b*) dele *in.*
—— 116, line 4 3, (*b*) for . *He*, read , *he.*
—— 220, line 16, for *eſpecially*, read *particularly.*
—— 492, line 16, for *again*, read *againſt.*
—— 533, line 9 (*b*) for *laſt*, read *firſt.*

MVSEVM BRITANNICVM